THE TEACHER SPECIALIST ON SITE PROGRAM
Year Three Summative Review

Report
to the
South Carolina Education Oversight Committee
The Division of Accountability

PO Box 11867
Blatt Building, Rm 227
Columbia, SC 29211

www.sceoc.org

February, 2005

Contents

Executive Summary

The Education Oversight Committee (EOC) is charged with reviewing and monitoring the implementation and evaluation of the Education Accountability Act (EAA) and Education Improvement Act (EIA) programs and funding. During fall 2001 the EOC requested an evaluation of the Teacher Specialist on Site (TSOS) program and approved a three-year evaluation model, with annual formative reports. For purposes of this evaluation, the focus was limited to 2001-2002, 2002-2003, and 2003-2004 school years.

The Teacher Specialist on Site (TSOS) Program is one of five technical assistance strategies mandated in the Education Accountability Act of 1998. The TSOS program provides exemplary teachers to work in demonstration and coaching with teachers in schools rated Unsatisfactory of Below Average. The study follows 61 schools over a three year period to explore the implementation and impact of the program.

The EOC staff worked with representatives of the SC State Department of Education (SDE) to establish the following principal research question:

> Does student achievement improve in schools assigned teacher specialists?

Five related questions also were identified:

- How has student achievement improved over time in schools assigned teacher specialists?
- Are there changes in the school community and/or culture during the years with teacher specialists?
- How has the teacher specialist program impacted upon the instructional skills and professional growth of the teachers involved?
- How has the program functioned over time?
- What are the unintended consequences of the teacher specialist program?

Over the three years of program implementation, the State Department of Education (SDE) recruited, prepared and supervised as many as 250 teacher specialists in schools across the state. Because the availability of teacher specialists was less than the projected need, the SDE implemented a tiered approach to services based upon the intensity of the academic needs at a particular school. The tiered approach ultimately resulted in the placement of technical assistance personnel other than teacher specialists at many schools.

The teacher specialist program is grounded in the coaching model and struggles to implement the program in South Carolina mirror struggles nationally with the coaching model. Over the program years, the SDE has received substantial funding and legislative latitude to implement the program in schools demonstrating the most significant needs. In circumstances such as those present in Tier Two schools (i.e., those in need of assistance but not at the lowest performance level) the impact of the teacher specialists program in combination with other resources has been positive. The program has contributed to gains in schools in which teacher specialists have been assigned; in those schools designated to receive teacher specialists but not assigned teacher specialists the gains have not been realized. The SDE has chosen to customize the program to school settings in order to gain the greatest benefit from the assistance personnel available. This customization runs somewhat counter to advice from national resources on program fidelity and confounds the ability of any evaluation study to define program elements that contribute most to success and should be replicated in other settings.

The teacher specialist model is a viable option to improve instruction in a school; data presented in this report offer documentation of circumstances in which the model is successful as evidenced in improvements in student achievement and/or school ratings. The model, however, has not gained the widespread confidence of practitioners or policymakers who are not direct recipients of the program. Some argue that the model drains local school districts of their best teachers, despite data to the contrary. Others suggest that the work of teacher specialists is not prescribed sufficiently so that they are vulnerable to becoming quasi-administrators; others claim that the teacher specialists' time is overly controlled by the SDE. The SDE and Education Oversight Committee support alternative models to build capacity at the local level so that technical assistance is not needed again. State Superintendent Inez Tenenbaum promotes the use of the Teacher Advancement Program as an alternative to the teacher specialist model in appropriate settings and has contracted with Edison Schools to deliver supplemental services in Allendale schools.

A number of recommendations arise from this review and are offered below:

(1) The teacher specialist program should be defined clearly so that the particular strategies and practices are understood and there is evidence of faithful and reliable implementation by all program participants across all sites. While the need for customization is understood, the program is vulnerable to personal interpretations and misalignment.
(2) The teacher specialist program should be examined to determine if there are ways in which the program can contribute to the development of local capacity that sustains higher achievement beyond the years of state support.
(3) A single line of authority and responsibility should be defined so that the program supports development of local capacity and ownership and there is no confusion between technical assistance and state management.
(4) The teacher specialist program should employ the use of the improvement ratings in addition to expected progress measures to ensure that individual students are benefiting as they move through school.
(5) Those responsible for the teacher specialist program should explore the criteria for the alternative technical assistance program and use them as guidelines for future program development.
(6) The teacher specialist program should be coordinated with other program improvement efforts provided through federal, state or local authority. Inconsistencies should be addressed at the policy and administrative levels, rather than left to the teacher specialist or teacher to resolve.
(7) Easily understood materials should be developed to encourage understanding of the teacher specialist program and those situations in which it is effective by broader constituencies so that the program attracts supporters.
(8) The SDE should be provided adequate resources so that teacher specialists can be supported in their assignments and that local support can be nurtured.

PART I

Introduction

In 1998 the South Carolina General Assembly enacted the Education Accountability Act (EAA). The EAA, like many of its counterparts in other states, focuses the state's school improvement strategies upon five core elements of the system: standards, assessments, professional development and technical assistance, public reporting and rewards and interventions. Within the accountability system, underperforming schools are to be identified and provided with state-defined and state-funded technical assistance. The teacher specialist program is central among the technical assistance strategies and represents a major commitment from the state—in terms of actual dollars and assignment of personnel with a documented history of successful student achievement.

The Teacher Specialist on Site (TSOS) Program is one of five technical assistance strategies mandated in the Education Accountability Act of 1998. Each of these technical assistance strategies is targeted to improve the academic achievement of students as soon as possible and to sustain those improvements over time. Student achievement is measured by the state's accountability system that incorporates standards-based assessments or academic outcomes appropriate to a school organizational level. The TSOS program, administered by the State Department of Education (SDE), provides exemplary teachers to work in demonstration and coaching roles with teachers in schools rated Unsatisfactory or Below Average. The statute provides,

> §59-18-1530 (A) Teacher specialists on site must be assigned in any of the four core academic areas to a middle or high school in an impaired district or designated as below average or unsatisfactory, if the review team so recommends and recommendation is approved by the State Board of Education. Teacher specialists on site must be assigned at a rate of one teacher for each grade level with a maximum of five to elementary schools in impaired districts or designated as below average or unsatisfactory. The Department of Education, in consultation with the Division of Accountability, shall develop a program for the identification, selection, and training of teachers with a history of exemplary student academic achievement to serve as teacher specialists on site. Retired educators may be considered for specialists.
>
> (B) In order to sustain improvement and help implement the review team's recommendations, the specialists will teach and work with the school faculty on a regular basis throughout the school year for up to three years, or as recommended by the review committee and approved by the state board. Teacher specialists must teach a minimum of three hours per day on average in team teaching or teaching classes. Teacher specialists shall not be assigned administrative duties or other responsibilities outside the scope of this section. The specialists will assist the school in gaining knowledge of best practices and well-validated alternatives, demonstrate effective teaching, act as coach for improving classroom practices, give support and training to identify needed changes in classroom instructional strategies based upon analyses of assessment data, and support teachers in acquiring new skills. School districts are asked to cooperate in releasing employees for full-time or part-time employment as a teacher specialist.
>
> (C) To encourage and recruit teachers for assignment to below standard and unsatisfactory schools, those assigned to such schools will receive their salary and a supplement equal to fifty percent of the current southeastern average teacher salary as projected by the State Budget and Control Board, Office of Research and Analysis. The salary and supplement is to be paid by the State for three years.

The TSOS Program is constructed to provide daily coaching for teachers utilizing the professional development models and practices identified as effective by the National Staff Development Council.[1] Although not identical in structure or implementation, the statutory model is influenced by the experiences of the Kentucky Distinguished/Highly Skilled Educator program.[2] This report must note that the Kentucky Distinguished Educator Program currently employs 50 individuals in those roles to serve 90 schools and therefore, differs significantly from the South Carolina model.[3]

The assignment of teacher specialists was triggered by the publication of the first school ratings in December 2001. Working with projections from 2000 student test performance, in spring 2001 the SDE began recruiting individuals to serve as teacher specialists and realized that the number of individuals qualifying for the positions and available to travel to the schools rated Unsatisfactory or Below Average fell short of the number presumed in the statute. The SDE proposed and subsequently received permission from the General Assembly to enact a tiered approach to technical assistance. The approach was codified as follows:

> SECTION 59-18-1595. Reallocation of technical assistance funding.
>
> Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and in order to provide assistance at the beginning of the school year, schools may qualify for technical assistance based on the criteria established by the Education Oversight Committee for school ratings and on the most recently available PACT scores. In order to best meet the needs of low-performing schools, the funding provided for technical assistance under the Education Accountability Act may be reallocated among the programs and purposes specified in this section. The State Department of Education shall establish criteria for reviewing and assisting schools that will be rated unsatisfactory using a tiered system with the lowest-performing schools receiving highest priority. Not to exceed the statewide total number of specialists stipulated by the Education Accountability Act, the highest priority school assistance shall include a year-long technical assistance team that may include a lead principal or curriculum specialist, or both. All specialists shall have a demonstrated record of success in their field and shall be entitled to the incentives and benefits of a teacher specialist. Technical assistance for below average schools shall be provided to the extent possible in order of need. The State Department of Education shall provide information on the technical assistance strategies and their impact to the State Board of Education, the Education Oversight Committee, the Senate Education Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, the House of Representatives Education and Public Works Committee, and the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee annually.

Over the three years of program implementation under study, the SDE received permission from the General Assembly, through provisos in the General Appropriations Act, to modify the statutory vision of the program either to recruit more individuals to the teacher specialist role or to extend teacher specialist services to teachers of student groups not outlined in the statute. These modifications are the following:

> In Fiscal Year 2002 the General Assembly provided that more than five teacher specialists could be assigned to a school upon recommendation of the external review team and that a teacher specialist could be assigned to work with kindergarten teachers. Retirees could be hired as teacher specialists.

[1] National Staff Development Council, "NSDC Standards for Staff Development (Revised), 1998, 2001.
[2] Education Commission of the States, "What States Are Doing," 2000.
[3] Education Week, "State Unable to Help All Struggling Schools," January 7, 2004, pages 19-23.

In Fiscal Year 2003 the General Assembly provided that school enrollment could be a factor in assignment of teacher specialists and allowed teacher specialists to remain in that role for a fourth year, but without maintenance of contracts in their home districts.

In Fiscal Year 2004, the General Assembly provided that teacher specialists could be assigned across grade levels and content areas and could be assigned to work with teachers of students with disabilities and/or students with limited English proficiency. Teacher specialists were allowed to remain in that role for a fifth year.

SDE leaders indicate that there are seventeen categories for teacher specialists (e.g., middle grades math). SDE leaders suggest that these multiple categories and the utilization of principal specialists, principal leaders, curriculum and instruction facilitators and district instructional facilitators enable the agency to "customize" the technical assistance to each school. [4]

Structure of the Three Year Evaluation

The EAA also established the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) to oversee the implementation of the EAA as well as complete other duties to maintain a focus on results. The EOC is charged with specific duties including, "review and monitor the implementation and evaluation of the Education Accountability Act and Education Improvement Act programs and funding."[5] Working through the EOC Subcommittee on the Education Improvement Act and Improvement Mechanisms, the EOC asked its staff to conduct an evaluation of the Teacher Specialist on Site (TSOS) program. The EOC approved a three-year evaluation model, with annual formative reports. Formative data collections were scheduled for the academic years of 2001-2002, 2002-2003, and 2003-2004, with a full evaluation report published in winter 2005. Teacher specialists employed as a strategy at schools under the authority of the Education Improvement Act of 1984 impaired school district identification are excluded from this study. For purposes of this evaluation, the focus was limited to the three years stated above.

The EOC staff worked with staff from the SDE to identify the following principal research question:

Does student achievement improve in schools assigned teacher specialists?

Five related questions also were identified:

- How has student achievement improved over time in schools assigned teacher specialists?
- Are there changes in the school community and/or culture during the years with teacher specialists?
- How has the teacher specialist program impacted upon the instructional skills and professional growth of the teachers involved?
- How has the program functioned over time?
- What are the unintended consequences of the teacher specialist program?

The EOC and SDE also worked with the University of South Carolina (USC) Education Policy Center on the evaluation. The USC Center assumed responsibility for comprehensive surveys administered and published in the First and Second Year Formative Reviews of the Teacher Specialist on Site program.[6] Costs of the evaluation were borne by the South Carolina Education Oversight Committee and the USC Policy Center. The EOC is funded through an Education Improvement Act

[4] Dr. John Suber, Testimony to the EIA Subcommittee, Education Oversight Committee, December 13, 2004.
[5] §59-6-10(A) (1), 1976 South Carolina Code of Laws, as amended.
[6] South Carolina Education Oversight Committee, First Year Formative Review of the Teacher Specialist on Site Program, 2003 and Second Year Formative Review of the Teacher Specialist on Site Program, 2004.

appropriation and the USC Policy Center work is funded through a proviso in the General Appropriations Act that authorizes its work on projects mutually defined by USC, EOC and SDE.

Factors Confounding the Implementation, Impact and Evaluation of the Program

The implementation, impact and evaluation of the Teacher Specialist on Site Program is confounded by four factors: variations in program implementation from that outlined in the original statute; differences in school assistance staffing configurations in which teacher specialists are assigned; lack of specificity in roles and expectations within the tiered assistance configurations; and the challenge of implementing multiple improvement strategies coherently in one setting.

The statute presumes the integration of four technical assistance strategies in each of the identified schools and, upon the occasion of a district request, the assignment of a principal specialist. The four strategies include diagnosis of the critical challenges and recommendations for assignment of assistance personnel and other actions from an external review team, professional development for teachers using retraining grant allocations, extended learning for students through after-school programs and coaches for teachers to build their expertise. The statute and subsequent provisos suggest assignment of teacher specialists to each grade or content area depending upon school organizational level. Although there is not a teacher specialist to teacher ratio specified in the statute, it is reasonable to expect that there are limits beyond which the teacher specialist is able to be as effective as the statute intends. Data reported in 2003 confirm that the specialist may work with as few as one teacher or as many as 20. Data presented in the appendices suggest that the ratios are lower when the relationship of teacher specialists to teachers actually served is measured and documents SDE efforts to lower the ratio of teachers to teacher specialists. The external review team report provides recommendations for teacher specialists: the SDE employs a protocol for the priority assignments in accordance with the strategy published in Appendix C. Schools rated Below Average participate in a desk audit in lieu of receiving an external review team. Assignments of teacher specialists in these schools are likely to be influenced by administrator receptivity rather than the external process.

In response to differences and preferences among local districts and to overcome personnel shortages, the SDE has used varying numbers of teacher specialists in combination with principal specialists, principal leaders, curriculum specialists, curriculum facilitators and off-site support from SDE personnel. The combinations result in different configurations of working relationships and responsibilities to which the teacher specialists are assigned and dilute the data base from which judgments about the program can be made. Data presented in *The Teacher Specialist Program: Year Two Formative Review* defined a minimum of ten program configurations. In the 2003-2004 academic year, the SDE defined seven priorities among the three tiers and assigns personnel in accordance with those priorities. Because of the variations within and across the configurations it is difficult to attribute changes in achievement to the teacher specialist program or to identify replicable practices that can inform instruction in other South Carolina schools. Data presented later in this report document improvements in these schools, although not at the rate of improvement for all South Carolina schools. Are the improvements the result of the accountability environment, the impact of additional personnel in schools, the focus on particular instructional practices or a combination of these?

The technical assistance model is premised upon the implementation of "best practices" as presented in the preparation provided teacher specialists by the SDE. The SDE employs a "leadership team strategy" rather than a specific program framework (e.g., Success for All, Direct Instruction, School Development Program), with emphasis on team building, alignment of instruction with content standards and vertical curriculum calibration. Without a consistent and coherent program model to guide the integration of actions, the success or failure of the reform strategy cannot be attributed to particular policies and practices. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory recommends that reform models incorporate the following:

- Innovative strategies and proven methods that are based on reliable research and replicated successfully in schools with diverse characteristics
- A comprehensive design for effective school functioning;
- Measurable goals for student performance and benchmarks for meeting those goals;
- Commitment and support of school staff and community;
- Meaningful involvement of parents and local community;
- High quality external technical support and assistance;
- Evaluation plan for monitoring program implementation and assessing results in student achievement;
- Coordinated resources to maximize and sustain the school reform effort;
- High quality and continuous teacher and staff professional development.[7]

With differing understandings of which practices are best for the particular situation and changing personnel (both school and technical assistance) the instructional program provided students and the substance and nature of professional development and coaching provided to teachers can vary significantly from site to site. Variations in the model because of combinations of personnel, differences in selection, orientation and professional development) and different lines of authority (some technical assistance personnel report to the SDE, while others report to the district administration) increase the need for a defined program model to ensure fidelity of implementation and reliable understanding of best practices across sites. As the survey data report, teachers also expect the teacher specialist to provide instructional materials and/or tutoring services.[8] While these may be needed, linking them to the teacher specialist attaches an expectation to the program beyond coaching and may interfere with those coaching responsibilities. For example, in the data collection process for the 2003 annual review of retraining grants, nearly 20 percent of the respondents were teacher specialists which suggests that the teacher specialist is performing administrative functions. Data presented in the first and second year formative reviews affirmed the need for teachers and principals to have a clear understanding of the program and to assign tasks accordingly. The SDE modified orientation for administrators in an attempt to build local support and ownership, although these efforts are undercut by frequent transition in administrators.

The program goal, as understood by participants, is to "get off the list;" that is, to improve the school's absolute rating. EOC and SDE leaders agree that sustainable change requires the development of capacity over time and that "getting off the list" is a short-term objective that may or may not incorporate those decisions and actions necessary for development of local capacity.[9] In winter 2004 the State Board of Education submitted regulations to the General Assembly that would define the progress expectations for schools rated Unsatisfactory (see Appendix B). These regulations require schools receiving technical assistance to gain .3 of one point in their absolute rating indices over a two-year cycle. This is roughly equivalent to an average improvement rating (.2 of one point) across the two years. There is a critical difference in that the SDE expected improvement measure is based upon comparison on cohorts, not individual student achievement gains or stability across time as expected in the Education Accountability Act improvement rating.

[6]Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory: Evaluating Whole-School Reform Efforts, 2000).

[8] South Carolina Education Oversight Committee, First Year Formative Review of the Teacher Specialist on Site Program, 2003 and Second Year Formative Review of the Teacher Specialist on Site Program, 2004.

[9] The pitfalls of varied understandings were cited recently in a study by the RAND Corporation. RAND evaluated the implementation of three different models implemented and supported in the Cincinnati School District. When teachers were surveyed; researchers determined that many were uncertain about what they were supposed to be implementing. The RAND Study found that only 57 percent of the teachers could identify the model being used in their school; 27 percent felt they could explain the model's philosophy to others; 44 percent were unclear about success criteria; 38 percent felt that lack of success would lead to termination of the program; 22 percent felt that their personal efforts would affect the success of the design and 23 percent said they had strayed from the design. Bodily, S.M., Keltner, B., Purnell, S. W., Reichardt, R.E., and Schuyler, G. L., *Lessons from New American Schools' scale-up phase: Prospects for bringing designs to multiple schools.* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1998.)

Therefore, expected progress gives information on the school over time but does not measure individual student gains.

Finally, the technical assistance strategies are implemented in an environment dominated by the need to improve all schools and the particular challenges of economic recession. Repeated mid-year reductions in funding impact program aspiration as well as program implementation. When managers suspect another budget reduction is to be imposed, they plan based upon the lower resources, and without intending to do so, may lower expectations for the program. Concurrent with the receipt of technical assistance, these schools are eligible and participating in an array of programs intended to promote higher achievement. Each of the schools is eligible for retraining grants, homework center funds, K-5 Enhancement grants, and math and science coaches from state funds. The schools also may participate in the SC Reading Initiative. Seven of the schools are recipients of *Reading First* grants from federal funds as well as (all but three) schools receive Title One funds. These programs may or may not be integrated at the state, district or school level. Some South Carolina educators have suggested that program leaders are "fighting over the teachers." A study of reform implementation in the Chicago Public Schools indicates that, schools facing dramatic challenges may find themselves . . .

> "caught in a bind. They want to acquire programs and materials that might help them to teach more effectively, but they soon find themselves in a large and fragmented circuit of school improvement activity. Principals may recognize that faculty members' attention is scattered, but hooking up with multiple initiatives seems to be the only way to gain needed resources and to promote the commitment of staff with different interests and strengths. . .With so many demands, principals feel unable to refuse programs and reason that diverse programs will somehow complement one another. They continue to adopt or pilot programs but do little to establish or strengthen coordination and coherence among them."[10]

This circumstance is more common than good practice would support. Newmann, et. al. advocate that three conditions be met for instructional program coherence:

- A common instructional framework guides curriculum, teaching, assessment, and learning climate. The framework combines specific expectations for student learning with specific strategies and materials to guide teaching and assessment;
- Staff working conditions support implementation of the framework; and
- The school allocates resources such as funding, materials, time and staff assignments to advance the school's common instructional framework and to avoid diffuse, scattered improvement efforts.[11]

Therefore, a clear view of the program is hampered by the varying answers to three fundamental questions: who is responsible to whom and for what; to what programs or services can improvement be attributed; and how can the model (when successful) be replicated?

[10]Newmann, Fred. M., Smith, BetsAnn, Allensworth, Elaine, and Bryk, Anthony S. "Instructional Program Coherence4: What It Is and Why It Should Guide School Improvement Policy," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, V23, N4, winter 2001.
[11]Newmann, et. al.

PART II

The Coaching Model

The teacher specialist on site program mirrors school-based coaching models, originally implemented in urban school districts. The most highly publicized programs are in New York City's Community School District 2, the Boston Public Schools, the Dallas Independent School District's Reading Plan and in America's Choice schools. The model employs embedded professional development and conforms to the advice of a large number of educational researchers. This advice tells us that to be effective "professional development must be ongoing, deeply embedded in teachers' classroom work with children, specific to grade levels or academic content, and focused on research-based approaches. It also must help open classroom doors and create more collaboration and sense of community among teachers in schools."[12]

The model further incorporates at least five of the National Staff Development Council Standards (summarized here):

- The organization of educators into learning communities that have clear goals consistent with school and district goals;
- Effective leadership to support continuous instructional improvement
- The application of research to school and classroom strategies and decision-making;
- Support for teacher collaboration; and
- The development of educators' skills at increasing parent involvement.[13]

Most authors acknowledge that the model is expensive—coaches are recruited from the regular teaching force requiring the recruitment and training of replacements. District and school leadership must be prepared to initiate policies and practices supportive of the coaching model, the coaches must be trained for their roles and responsibilities and the school must have resources to fund other changes in the learning environment including the acquisition of new materials and technology, facilities to accommodate teacher planning, demonstration lessons and small group instruction and others that may be particular to the school context.

South Carolina implemented the coaching model within a national professional climate that emphasized its utility. Early evaluations and advice based upon experience with the model did not gain visibility in the professional literature until at least 2003 and, even with these reports; there is little evidence of the long-term impact on student achievement. Two 2003 publications are cited frequently as evaluations of the model—*Making Our Own Road: The Emergence of School-Based Staff Developments in America's Public Schools* by Alan Richard and published by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation in May 2003 and *Coaching, A Strategy for Developing Instructional Capacity: Promises and Practicalities* written by Barbara Neufield and Dana Roper and published by The Aspen Institute Program on Education and the Annenberg Institute for School Reform in June 2003.

The advice from these reports is practical and focuses on effective implementation. The advice, based upon experience in a number of situations, reflects the South Carolina experience. These reports suggest that the hurdles and complexities of implementation in South Carolina are common to other situations using the coaching model. The common inference from the experiences is that the coaching model has great potential to improve school capacity when it is implemented optimally.

[12] Russo Alexander. School-Based Coaching. Harvard Education Letter, July August 2004.
[13] NSCD, 2001

Neufield and Roper state that "[n]o one, as yet, has proved that coaching contributes significantly to increased student achievement. Indeed, there are scant studies of this form of professional development and how it influences teachers' practice and students' learning. However, in light of our current knowledge about what it takes to change a complex practice like teaching, there are reasons to think that coaching, in combination with other professional development strategies, is a plausible way to increase schools' instructional capacity."[14] Neufield and Roper cite studies by Linda Darling-Hammond and M. W. McLaughlin that identify the essential elements of teacher professional development:

- It must be grounded in inquiry, reflection, and experimentation that are participant-driven
- It must be collaborative, involving a sharing of knowledge among educators and a focus on teachers' communities of practice rather than on individual teachers
- It must be sustained, ongoing, intensive and supported by modeling, coaching and collective solving of specific problems of practice
- It must be connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students
- It must engage teachers in concrete task of teaching, assessment, observation and reflection that illuminate the processes of learning and development
- It must be connected to other aspects of school change.[15]

Coaching is not an easy model to implement. Alan Richard visited with coaches in four states (including South Carolina) and suggested that the situations and supports in which the coaching model is being implemented are generally inadequate. Richard writes, "it appears that at many other schools, embedded staff developers are expected to lead school improvement by themselves with little outside direction or support. Frequently their jobs are poorly defined and invented "on the fly" as they grapple with the immediate needs of novice teachers, the suspicions of veterans, the various expectations of district- and school-level administrators, and the increasing demands of high-stakes accountability environment . . . The ultimate fate of this emerging model of professional development will depend largely on the willingness of district and school leaders to devote the time and resources needed to transform a promising but often poorly focused school improvement tactic into a coherent, well-supported reform strategy."[16]

Neufield and Roper identify conditions essential for successful coaching. The conditions are the following:

- Provide clear, explicit and continuing support for the coaching program
- Understand the reforms in which schools are engaged and possess the knowledge and skill with which to support schools in implementing them
- Ensure that the coaches have well-specified roles and make coaches' roles and responsibilities clear to all of the district's educators
- Provide principals with professional development that enables them to create a school culture in which coaching is both routine and safe
- Ensure that the process of selecting coaches at the district and school levels is rigorous and fair and results in the hiring of coaches who will be credible to the teachers and principals with whom they work
- Honor coaches' roles and do not divert their time to other school needs
- Acknowledge that conversations between coaches and principals about teachers' work might cause tension
- Have substantial knowledge about the content reforms their teachers are trying to implement.

[14] Neufield, Barbara , p. 1
[15] Neufield, p. 3
[16] Richard, p. 3

PART III

Implementation of the Teacher Specialist Model in South Carolina

The South Carolina statute initiating the Teacher Specialist on Site Program is very specific. In elementary schools a teacher specialist is to be assigned to each of the grades in the school (one through five is anticipated) and a teacher specialist at the rate of one per each major academic content area in middle and high schools. As was cited earlier the General Assembly modified the assignment provisions over the three years of implementation to accommodate differences in school enrollment and student population.

Roles and Responsibilities of Teacher Specialists

Over time the roles and responsibilities of teacher specialists changed slightly. The roles and responsibilities of teacher specialists are published in the Teacher Specialist Handbook. The duties changed slightly during program implementation as shown below. Between the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 year the duties reflect more specific responsibilities for curriculum and instruction coordination with less emphasis on supporting individual teachers. The changes may impact on the critical trust between teacher and teacher specialist.

Figure 1
Responsibilities of the Teacher Specialist on Site

2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
Provide the services of a teacher specialist for the two hundred-day contract	Provide the services of a teacher specialist for the two hundred-day contract	Provide the services of a teacher specialist for the two hundred day contract for the academic school year
Teach a minimum of three hours per day on average in team teaching, tutoring, and/or demonstrating lessons	Teach a minimum of three hours per day on average in team teaching, tutoring, and/or demonstrating lessons	Teach a minimum of three hours per day on average in team teaching, tutoring, and/or demonstrating lessons
Assist the school faculty in gaining knowledge of best practices and well-validated alternatives designed to improve instruction	Assist the school faculty in gaining knowledge of best practices and well-validated alternatives designed to improve instruction	Assist the school faculty in gaining knowledge of best practices and well-validated alternatives designed to improve instruction Lead efforts to infuse technology into classroom instruction Commit to sharing experiences and expertise with school and staff through staff development Comply with requests to provide in-service
Demonstrate effective teaching and act as a coach for improving classroom practices, especially as it related to connecting activities to the state's curriculum standards and assessment system	Demonstrate effective teaching and act as a coach for improving classroom practices, especially as it related to connecting activities to the state's curriculum standards and assessment system	Demonstrate effective teaching and act as a coach for improving classroom practices, especially as it related to connecting activities to the state's curriculum standards and assessment system
Provide support and training to identify needed changes in classroom instructional strategies based upon analyses of assessment data	Provide support and training to identify needed changes in classroom instructional strategies based upon analyses of assessment data	Provide support and training to identify needed changes in classroom instructional strategies based upon analyses of assessment data

Assist school teams in analyzing test data to identify patterns and instructional deficiencies	Assist school teams in analyzing test data to identify patterns and instructional deficiencies	Assist the instructional staff and teachers in assessing student performance, interpreting data and making curricula recommendations to ensure high achievement and to reflect best practices Establish high expectations for student achievement Assist in the development of a system to record student progress Work with the building principal and the assistance team to promote understanding of the curriculum and the priorities within it
Develop strategies for addressing instructional deficiencies, including techniques to improve classroom assessment, and to support teachers in acquiring new skills	Develop strategies for addressing instructional deficiencies, including techniques to improve classroom assessment, and to support teachers in acquiring new skills	Develop strategies for addressing instructional deficiencies, including techniques to improve classroom assessment, and to support teachers in acquiring new skills
Serve as an instructional leader by providing information and assistance in activities relevant to improving teacher quality and curriculum	Serve as an instructional leader by providing information and assistance in activities relevant to improving teacher quality and curriculum	Provide direct support for building and classroom curriculum efforts Work with teachers and the principal to identify needed instructional materials
Serve as a member of the assistance team if applicable and work collaboratively with other team members in performing job responsibilities	Serve as a member of the assistance team if applicable and work collaboratively with other team members in performing job responsibilities	Take an active role in collaborating with the school's principal and staff on curriculum and instruction
Participate in any and all training/staff development and assignments given and/or directed by the Department	Participate in any and all training/staff development and assignments given and/or directed by the Department	Attend all scheduled meetings Complete and submit all assignments and updates in a timely manner Complete all assignments relevant to Curriculum and Instruction as directed by the building principal or building supervisor
Abide by the guidelines established by the Department for the role and responsibilities of teacher specialists.[17]	Abide by the guidelines established by the Department for the role and responsibilities of teacher specialists.[18]	Abide by the guidelines established by the Department for the role and responsibilities of teacher specialists.[19]

Recruitment

Anticipating the identification of a large number of schools through the Education Accountability Act ratings, the SDE began recruiting teacher specialists in the spring of 2001. The SDE anticipated the

[17]SC State Department of Education, "Teacher Specialist on Site: Teacher Specialist Manual," 2002.
[18]SC State Department of Education, "Teacher Specialist on Site: Teacher Specialist Manual," 2002.
[19]SC State Department of Education, "Teacher Specialist on Site: Teacher Specialist Manual," 2002.

need for 250 teacher specialists, but ultimately employed 104. During the 2001 legislative session the SDE gained legislative permission for the tiered assistance program. Within the tiered program, schools are ranked according to the value of their absolute indices and more assistance personnel assigned to the most severe situations. The assistance personnel could include a principal leader and/or a curriculum and instruction facilitator. In subsequent years, despite more aggressive recruitment strategies, the SDE has not been able to employ the equivalent of five teacher specialists for each eligible school and subsequently expanded both the types and number of other personnel used.

The SDE encountered other difficulties in recruiting individuals to the Teacher Specialist on Site program. The misalignment of schedules for the identification of schools, appropriation of funds and teacher contract schedules confounds the recruitment challenges. The SDE is recruiting individuals to serve as teacher specialists at the same time the SDE is seeking funding for the program. The statutory schedule for teacher contracts requires commitments by late April, funding is not finalized until June and training must occur in July.

Funding required for the program is based upon school ratings, recommendations of the external review teams and available teacher specialists. The program appropriations are shown below. Funding in excess of SDE placement of teacher specialists in each of the years shown has been used to support the tiered system of technical assistance.

Funding for Teacher and Principal Specialists

Fiscal Year 1999	$1,455,239
Fiscal Year 2000	5,206,698
Fiscal Year 2001	10,469,189
Fiscal Year 2002	19,602,447
Fiscal Year 2003	33,862,589
Fiscal Year 2004	32,365,839
Fiscal Year 2005	33,977,962

NOTE: Funding for principal specialists never exceeds $1.5 million

Teacher specialists, by statute, receive a salary supplement equal to one-half of the southeastern average teacher salary—approximately $20,000. Including fringe benefits, the average teacher specialist compensation approximates $88,000. The SDE also uses funds for professional development, program supervision and materials. The enabling legislation does not state specifically the impetus for the salary supplement. Over the program implementation years there has been some debate as to the issues the supplement should address. There is general agreement that the supplement recognizes the selective nature of the teacher specialist process and the change in role within the teaching profession. There is a feeling among some legislators that the supplement was intended to entice exemplary teachers to the underachieving schools, often assumed to be in the geographically isolated regions of South Carolina. The statute did not define these reasons nor did the statute place any restrictions upon assignment. Therefore, the supplement is assigned to individuals serving in the role of teacher specialist based upon their acceptance into the program and assignment to schools. The assigned school may be in the home district of the teacher.

As the program attracted teachers from schools and districts, a number of district superintendents expressed concerns that the program would attract better teachers away from their schools; thereby lowering the likelihood that those schools would continue to score well.

Early in the program some concerns also were raised regarding the difficulty in placing teacher specialists in rural counties. The General Assembly required the SDE and the EOC to investigate incentives as outlined in the following proviso:

> . . .that the Education Oversight Committee and the State Department of Education shall examine base and supplementary compensation for teacher specialists and those fulfilling similar responsibilities in other states to determine if adjustments in the compensation should be made to encourage teacher specialist to serve in rural areas. . .[20]

The study, published in November 2002, found the following:

- Vacancies in the [teacher specialist] program are no more likely to be in rural or "isolated" school districts, than in urban school districts
- Shortages in the [teacher specialists] are as likely to be linked to school climate, the availability of housing, and the match between teachers specialists' certification and school needs as the shortage is linked to rural/urban school settings;
- Fifty school districts located throughout the state provided [teacher specialists] to the program in 2002-2003 and teachers did relocate to serve schools in other districts. No school district provided a disproportionate number of [teacher specialists] as compared to their workforce; and
- More flexibility is needed in the [teacher specialist] program in relation of the ability of applicants to select multiple grade levels or subject areas in the program and in selection of districts after someone has been chosen as a teacher specialist.[21]

Subsequent to the report the SDE modified its procedures to permit individuals to apply for and work as teacher specialists across multiple grade levels or content areas as long as their certification supported that assignment. Annually the SDE monitors and reports on the number of teachers pulled from any one district or school. For 2004-2005, only four schools have two teachers serving as a teacher specialist in other schools.

The difficulty of attracting teachers to challenging situations mirrors the experiences of the teacher specialist program and, as detailed later in this report, confounds program success. In a November 2002 survey of teachers, the EOC asked teachers to indicate which incentives, if any, would persuade them to teach in under-performing and rural schools. Only 16 percent of teachers said they could *not* be enticed, regardless of the incentive offered. The exact question and responses are shown below:[22]

> Historically, under-performing and rural schools have difficulty recruiting and retaining teachers. Which of these incentives would encourage you to teach in these schools?

The same salary schedule as paid in more urban schools	30%
Salary supplements based on characteristics of the school	21%
Incentives such as tuition reimbursements, mileage costs, etc.	11%
Salary supplements based on performance	3%
Housing so I could live in the community	1%
Other	7%
Would not be enticed, regardless	16%
No Answer	1%

[20] General Appropriations Act 2002-2003.
[21] South Carolina Education Oversight Committee and South Carolina State Department of Education, Report to the General Assembly Pursuant to Proviso XXXX, November 2002.
[22] Brown, Frank. Report to the Education Oversight Committee, January 2003.

Participant Perceptions of the Program

Over the first two years of this evaluation, the USC Educational Policy Center conducted surveys to determine teacher, administrator and teacher specialist perceptions of the program.

In 2001-2002 SCPEC staff administered the questionnaires during faculty meetings at 17 schools that had participated in the TSOS program for at least two years and had at least three teacher specialists assigned to the school. Respondents were generally favorable about the program, citing the emphasis on teaching strategies to increase student achievement as the major strength; however, responses suggest that the program faces difficulties when there is inadequate local ownership of the program and/or improvement strategy. The major findings include the following:

- Principals, teacher specialists, and teachers expressed positive views about the TSOS program. Seventy-seven percent of the principals, 84 percent of the teacher specialists, and 71 percent of the teachers graded the program "A" or "B." A failing grade of "F" was assigned by four to six percent of the respondent groups.

- Sixty-nine percent of the teachers, 83 percent of the teacher specialists, and 94 percent of the principals agreed that the implementation of the program had gone smoothly.

- The school climate for the program was generally quite positive. An atmosphere of mutual respect and trust seemed to exist in almost all schools. Seventy-five percent of the teachers and all but two of the principals reported that they enjoyed working with the teacher specialists.

- Despite the generally favorable climate for the program, only 46 percent of teachers and 56 percent of principals agreed that they felt "ownership" in the TSOS program.

- Sixty-five percent of the teachers, 88 percent of principals, and 95 percent of the teacher specialists agreed that the TSOS had "contributed greatly to the effectiveness of the instructional program at this school."

- Teachers most frequently mentioned that the TSOS program had resulted in improvements in instruction, teacher skills, the use of best practices, and the alignment of the curriculum to the state standards.

- Between five percent and 15 percent of the teachers were consistently negative about the TSOS program and the work of individual teacher specialists.

- Potential areas for improvement in the implementation of the TSOS program include program training, program ownership and support, program monitoring, and engaged time with teachers.[23]

For the second year formative report, the USC Policy Center again surveyed program participants. Of the 84 schools, 46 schools were in their first year of program participation, 22 in their second year, seven in their third year, and nine in their fourth year. The number of teacher specialists per school ranged from one to eight with an average of 2.4. Teacher specialists reported that they served an average of about six teachers. Teachers who worked with the specialists typically had a continuing contract (74 percent), although 26 percent of the teachers held annual, induction, or provisional contracts. Eighty-two percent of the teachers had a professional teaching certificate, eight percent had critical needs/PACE certification, and the remaining ten percent had initial, temporary, or special subject certificates. In some schools, all or a majority of teachers were

[23] Education Oversight Committee. Teacher Specialist on Site Program: First Year Formative Report, 2003.

veterans with the highest levels of certification or licensure. In other schools, the majority of teachers had been in the profession less than two years or held other types of certificates or licenses. Similarly, while some schools had veteran principals, one third of the principals were in their first or second year of the principalship and 59 percent had served in their current school for two years or less.

SCEPC's analysis of the questionnaire data found that:

- Eighty-six percent of the principals, 94 percent of the specialists, and 79 percent of the teachers assigned either an "A" or a "B" to the TSOS program. When asked to describe why they assigned the grade they did, principals and specialists most frequently stated that the program improved teacher effectiveness, teacher skills, instruction, alignment of curriculum, student achievement, and similar types of statements. Teachers said that the TSOS were encouraging, supportive, or helpful to them and inspired teamwork and collaboration.

- About 80 percent of the teachers and 90 percent of the principals and specialists agreed that the climate for implementation of the program was positive.

- Although many principals and teachers were new to their current school or new to the profession, about one-third of the principals and more than three-fourths of the teachers reported receiving less than one hour of training/orientation to the TSOS program prior to the first day of school in 2002-2003.

- About eight in ten teachers and nine in ten principals and specialists agreed that the climate for implementation of the program was positive.

- Nearly all principals and about 90 percent of the teachers agreed that the specialists had the content knowledge to be effective, had modeled instruction well, had responded promptly to requests for assistance, and had helped the faculty incorporate curriculum standards.

- In response to the item, "I support the teacher specialist program," 92 percent of principals agreed. The comparable figures for teacher specialists and teachers were 99 percent and 84 percent, respectively.

- Ninety-four percent of the principals agreed that they had been actively involved in program implementation, but fewer – 75 percent - said that they had a sense of ownership in the program. For teachers, only 57 percent agreed that they had a "sense of ownership," 19 percent were not sure, and 24 percent disagreed.

- Ninety-four percent of principals and 89 percent of the teachers agreed, "You can count on the teacher specialist to be at school, on the job, helping the school improve." Almost three-fourths of the teachers and more than four in five principals said that the program should continue to be funded, perhaps reflecting ambivalence about budget priorities.

- Eighty-nine percent of the principals, 93 percent of the specialists, and 74 percent of the teachers responded favorably to the item: "The teacher specialist program has contributed greatly to the effectiveness of instruction at this school."

- Eighty-four percent of the principals and 83 percent of the teachers planned to continue working at their current schools next year.

- Activities by the TSOS in the areas of demonstrating or modeling lessons, helping align instruction to the state standards, and sharing new strategies for instruction were noted by principals and teachers as most helpful to them.

- Although the TSOS received strong support from three-fourths of the teachers, the program was not without its detractors. Of the more than 800 teachers included in the study, about 18 percent were identified as "nay sayers." Nay sayers assigned grades of "C," "D," or "F" to the program and also disagreed with the proposition that the TSOS program "has contributed greatly to the effectiveness of the instructional program at the school." This group felt little program ownership, had little confidence that the program was improving their teaching or meeting their needs, and saw little prospect of going to the specialist for advice regarding classroom or personal problems. In contrast, the "supportive teachers," those assigning grades of "A," or "B" to the program and also agreeing with the proposition that the program had contributed greatly to the effectiveness of the instructional program at the school (two-thirds of the total), indicated greater trust in the teacher specialist, more confidence in the specialist's ability to improve the skills of the teacher, and greater ownership in the program.[24]

In response to the information and analyses presented in the Year One and Year Two formative reports the SDE modified its procedures to incorporate school performance data analyses across a three-year period as well as greater opportunity for training of local school and district administrators.

[24] Education Oversight Committee. Teacher Specialist on Site Program: Second Year Formative Report, 2004.

PART IV

Contributions to Student Achievement

Social, economic and educational aspects of a community manifest themselves in a synergistic impact on student achievement—either positively or negatively. Researchers and practitioners continually remind us of the positive dynamic of quality health care, early language development, parental attention and economic stability experienced by young people with economic advantages. The reverse also is represented in young people's achievement patterns. The schools rated Below Average and Unsatisfactory educate an overwhelmingly disadvantaged class of students. The students are isolated economically, educationally and often geographically.

The teacher specialist program, focusing on the delivery of instruction, has the potential to impact on one aspect of the student's educational experience. As Richard and Neufield and Roper point out, the coaching model works well only when it is a component of a multi-faceted school improvement strategy. Some would suggest that the mix of teacher specialists, principal specialists or leaders, professional development programs and homework center funding form a multi-faceted strategy. But the target of that strategy is within the school only, leaving the pervasive impact of poverty unaddressed.

For purposes of this three year evaluation, the EOC followed 61 schools designated for teacher specialists initially in the 2001-2002 school year. Over the three year period some of the schools were not assigned teacher specialists but were assigned different configurations of technical assistance personnel.

To determine if the program "worked", the context in which it was implemented must be considered. Under authority of the Education Accountability Act, Act 46 of 2001 and subsequent provisos in the General Appropriations Act, the SDE defined three levels of technical assistance. The tiered system, originally responsive to the shortage in teacher specialists and difference among schools, allowed the SDE to allocate resource persons based on priorities among school needs. The SDE indicates that the proviso also fosters involvement from the Mathematics and Science Hubs as well as other SDE offices. For the 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 academic years the SDE originally defined three tiers in accordance with the schools' absolute indices: schools with an absolute index below 2.0 on a 5.0 scale; schools with an absolute index of 2.0 or 2.1; and schools with an absolute index of 2.2 through 2.5. The SDE has varied the tier placements in 2003-2004 to define seven priority levels of service across the three tiers; therefore, the indices bands cited above may not represent current assignments. Several schools are shown as part of the "Other" category. This category includes schools identified under the EIA category.

The 61 schools originally included in the study, organized within the initial tier of service, are the following:

Tier One	Tier Two	Tier Three	Other
Allendale-Fairfax Middle	S. Fant Street	Allendale Elem	Allendale-Fairfax High
M. R. Rivers Middle	Denmark Olar E.	Fairfax Elem.	Denmark Olar High
Clyde Sanders Elem.	Denmark Olar M.	Scotts Branch Elem	Scotts Branch High
Estill High	Whale Branch E.		
	Whale Branch Middle	W. Hardeeville Elem	St. Paul Primary
Estill Middle	Mary Ford Elem.	Cleveland Elem.	Johnson Middle
Ridgeland Middle	Edmund Burns El.		Jasper County High
	Brentwood Middle		
Bishopville/Dennis Int. (2)	RD Schroder M.		Ridgeland Elem
Fleming Int.	Scotts Branch E/M		Bishopville Primary
Mt. Pleasant Middle	Spaulding Elem		Lee Central High

Tier One	Tier Two	Tier Three	Other
	JV Martin		
WA Perry Middle	Brockington Elem.		West Lee Elem
	Timmonsville Educ		Rains/Centenary
	Hollis Elem.		
			Terrells Bay High
	Monaview Elem.		
	Estill Elementary		
	Parker Middle		
	Lower Lee Elem		
	Bennettsville Middle		
	Elloree Elementary		
	Elloree High		
	Holly Hill Middle		
	Brookdale Middle		
	Rob. Howard Middle		
	Bowman M/H		
	Alcorn Middle		
	Crane Creek/Forest Heights		
	Gibbes Middle		
	Watkins-Nance Elementary		
	Whitlock Jr. High		
	Mayewood Middle		
	Battery Park Elem		

The assignment of teacher specialists to each school is detailed in the appendix. A number of the schools have merged or closed over the three years of the study as noted in the data tables used in this section.

Do the tiers differ on other variables? Analyses of school profile data (from 61 schools in this study) published in fall 2002, fall 2003 and fall 2004 suggest some variation among the tiers, particularly on teacher factors and the percentage of students with disabilities. These mean values are displayed in the table on the following pages.

Table 1
Summary of School Profile Data across Tiers

Profile Factor	Tier One			Tier Two			Tier Three			Other		
	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004
Retention percent	5.96	2.39	5.74	5.33	3.65	4.29	5.80	2.18	5.2	11.33	7.40	9.43
Older than Usual for Grade percent	9.47	16.22	8.81	5.65	8.87	5.49	3.36	3.02	3.98	9.85	9.39	10.06
Student Attendance percent	94.19	93.72	94.74	95.70	94.71	92.58	95.60	94.62	96.26	94.40	94.56	96.15
Students w/disabilities other than speech percent	15.42	14.80	14.65	12.61	13.19	11.93	7.70	8.96	8.24	8.70	9.32	10.62
Students eligible for state gifted and talented percent	3.13	3.08	3.5	4.46	5.33	5	7.72	5.92	3.92	3.65	4.55	3.98
Students suspended or expelled percent	2.48	6.64	7.17	3.58	1.81	1.92	0.46	3.02	1.14	1.53	5.20	1.93
Teachers with advanced degrees percent	39.70	40.22	40.31	42.63	42.36	43.32	43.10	45.66	44.72	35.95	39.64	45.32
Teachers returning from previous school year percent	67.87	64.67	68.19	75.79	76.69	68	77.04	78.18	81.52			71.46
Teachers with out-of-field permits percent	8.86	2.12	17.76	4.76	3.75	14.74	4.42	2.10	20.96	2.29	2.41	16.16
Teachers on continuing contracts percent	60.91	67.18	57.79	67.67	69.98	80.65	75.62	78.20	74.22	66.34	71.26	68.66
Teacher attendance percent	95.13	95.06	95.27	95.08	94.64	91.56	94.40	94.04	94.26	95.16	94.02	93.63
Average teacher salary	37,655.11	38,346.11	38,626	37,659.31	37,887.31	36,949	36,212.80	37,420.40	37,805	36,155.09	36,856.73	37,578
Prof. Dev Days per teacher	11	12.56	11.7	9.24	11.13	11.86	11.70	14.74	12.12	9.98	13.41	16.01
Student Teacher Ratio	17.40	17.54	17.56	17.13	16.51	16.89	14.34	15.80	22.6	13.47	19.45	20
Prime Instructional Time percent	88.92	86.62	87.62	88.92	87.51	85.18	88.96	86.26	87.88	88.55	85.99	78.78
Dollars spent per student	6466.00	7635.44	8197	6257.90	7151.88	6717	6008.80	7101.40	7601	6632.90	7158.73	6988
Percentage of $ spent on teacher salaries	62.86	47.11	58.81	61.68	59.65	59.44	55.66	61.06	61.64	60.44	60.76	60.03
Principal's Years at school	2.39	2.83	1.94	2.41	2.73	3.17	2.00	3.00	1.8	2.36	2.18	2.94
Parents attending conferences percent	86.03	75.63	90.39	77.92	83.20	82.54	80.28	72.76	82.34	72.88	90.00	82.62

The profile data continue to suggest that the schools have lower values on teacher quality measures (e.g., advanced degrees, continuing contracts, teachers returning) than do schools generally statewide and specifically schools that are rated higher. The increasing percentage of teachers on provision or out-of-field certificates should be noted. The increases are so substantial that the reliability of data reported across the three years should be explored. While smaller percentages of per pupil expenditures are spent on teacher salaries, the per pupil expenditures are generally higher than those statewide.

How has student achievement improved over time in schools assigned teacher specialists?

To explore student achievement, three measures are used: student performance on state assessments, absolute ratings indices, and school ratings. Student performance on state assessments includes the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Tests (percentage of students scoring below basic and percentage of students scoring proficient and advanced), and the Exit Exam (percentage of students passing all subtests on first attempt).

Student performance on state assessments varies. Tables 2-4 provide data on the percentage of students scoring Below Basic or Proficient and Advanced on PACT assessments and passing subtests of the Exit Exam on the first attempt. The calculation of the improvement rating index anticipates an approximate net gain of 5 percent of PACT matched scores as an "Average" improvement. Should low performing schools be expected to achieve Average improvement ratings, particularly when those schools are provided substantial additional resources from the state? Scores are taken from the SDE 2002, 2003 and 2004 test score reports published by the SDE. The five- percent threshold is chosen to minimize the impact of small enrollments. This analysis is based upon cohorts of students in membership at the school as of the 45th day of instruction and present for testing and their performance on the English language arts and mathematics assessments of the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test if students were enrolled in grades three through eight. Gains of five percent or greater are shown in bold type.

Table 2
Student Performance on State Assessments 2002, 2003 and 2004
Elementary and Middle Schools Assigned Teacher Specialists
Compared within Tier of Services

School	Initial Tier	PACT English language arts						PACT Mathematics					
		percent Below Basic			percent Proficient or Advanced			percent Below Basic			percent Proficient or Advanced		
		2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004
Allendale Fairfax Middle, 7-8	1	51.6	64.2	56	**0.6**	**3.5**	**8.9**	**63.8**	**54.6**	**55.4**	**4.6**	**6.3**	**9.7**
MR Rivers Middle, 6-8	1	63.8	63.6	65.2	4.6	1.4	1.4		67.6	67.3		3.1	2.7
Sanders Clyde Elementary, K-5	1	**54.7**	**61.2**	**40.9**	8.8	5.8	12.5	53.7	64.1	50	4	2.9	4.4
Estill Middle, 5-7	1	52.1	58.4	54	7.2	6	5.8	**68.8**	**62.8**	**47.8**	**3.4**	**7.2**	**10**
Ridgeland Middle, 5-8	1	63.6	61.6	58.5	6.8	5.6	5.6	47.7	66.2	62.2	15.2	4.3	6.7
Bishopville Intermediate, 6	1	Combined to form Dennis Intermediate											
Bishopville Intermediate, 4-5/Dennis Intermediate	1	50.7	53	46.7	9.4	6.8	12.3	**58.1**		**30.2**	8.2		12.7
Fleming Intermediate, 4-6	1	47		Closed	8.7		Closed	57.1		Closed	7.1		closed
Mt. Pleasant Middle, 7-8	1	**57.6**	**61**	**49.7**	6	4.6	9.5	**70.4**	**61.5**	**60.7**	5.8	6.2	6.3
WA Perry Middle, 6-8	1	49.4	54.3	59.8	10.2	8.5	6.1	**70.2**	**56.6**	**62.4**	6.1	8.8	7.6
South Fant St. Elementary, K-5	2	43.8	58.2	Closed	14.6	16.4	Closed	46.6	28.7	Closed	8.9	10.7	Closed
Denmark Olar Elementary, K-5	2	38.1	47.9	39.3	**12.9**	**11.2**	**18.39**	45.2	45	43	7.6	7	9
Denmark-Olar Middle, 7-8	2	**39.7**	**38.3**	**32.4**	15.5	14.6	17.9	**68.1**	**58.5**	**44.2**	**6.4**	**7.5**	**13.5**
Whale Branch Elementary, K-5	2	**51.5**	**54.8**	**44.5**	9.9	6.2	10.3	**64.4**	**54.8**	**54**	7.3	6.2	7
Whale Branch Middle, 6-8	2	**52**	**52.6**	**42.8**	**10.1**	**9.4**	**16.4**	**63.2**	**56.3**	**41**	**8**	**9.1**	**15**
Mary Ford Elementary, K-5	2	45.9	49.7	46.81	11.6	8.8	16.2	**48.6**	**35.7**	**41**	8.3	7.7	11
Brentwood Middle, 6-8	2	**60.3**	**68.8**	**65.6**	6.2	5.3	4.64	69.3	68	74	3.2	5.4	4
Edmund Burns Elementary, K-5	2	39.2	44.3	48.7	16.6	7.7	14.5	**56.3**	**47.8**	**38**	7.1	4.7	12
RD Schroder Middle, 6-8	2	43	50.8	42.1	9.8	8.4	11.3	**53.8**	**49.2**	**35**	7.9	8.8	10
Scotts Branch Elem/Middle, 4-5	2	43	53.3	44.7	12.5	6.3	9.6	**52.2**	**50.5**	**47**	7.7	5.2	6
Spaulding Elem, 4-6	2	**44.9**	**49.8**	**49.8**	13.7	9.1	10.9	**56.7**	**41.1**	**39**	**9.5**	**11.5**	**16**
JV Martin, 7-9	2	47.7	53.5	49.5	15.4	8.4	12.7	**61.9**	**55.6**	**54**	10.1	10.1	**9**
Brockington Elementary, K-5	2	30	39.9	38	**24.3**	**13**	**18.9**	34.1	39.1		22.6	8.4	

School	Initial Tier	PACT English language arts						PACT Mathematics					
		percent Below Basic			percent Proficient or Advanced			percent Below Basic			percent Proficient or Advanced		
		2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004
Hollis Elementary, K-5	2	50.7	65.7	52.6	9.9	4.9	13.28	60.1	54	58	7.5	5.2	**5**
Monaview Elementary, K-5	2	42.5	45.3	38.5	15.6	14.4	18.9	**41.9**	**30.9**	**35**	12.4	12.2	16
Parker Middle, 6-8	2	52.5	72	73	**10**	**3.1**	**4.6**	65.8	68.5	72	5	5.6	5
Estill Elementary, K-4	2	**49.6**	**40.6**	**28.2**	**9.7**	**14.2**	**28.2**	**60.3**	**47.5**	**29**	**7.6**	**8.7**	**13**
Lower Lee Elementary, K-3	2	**63**	**48.8**	**44.6**	**10.9**	**15**	**16**	**71.7**	**58.5**	**47**	13	9.8	9
Bennettsville Middle, 6-8	2	57.6	65	59.8	9.9	5	7	**69.5**	**63**	**63**	9.3	6.5	8
Elloree Elementary, K-6	2	43.2	39.8	39.1	11.1	18.1	21.2	**59**	**37.9**	**30**	**4.7**	**13.7**	**14**
Holly Hill Middle, 6-8	2	41.8	49.7	39.5	14.6	8.2	11.1	**55.3**	**47.5**	**43**	10.4	8.8	14
Brookdale Middle, 5-8	2	46		Closed	8.6		closed	56		Closed	6.6		closed
Robert Howard Middle, 5-8	2	42.4	46	42.7	11.8	11.5	12.5	**57.6**	**54.9**	**46**	7.1	4.6	9
Alcorn Middle, 6-8	2	53.9	59.7	55.4	8.2	5	7.0	58.2	57.6	60	6.6	6.9	7
Crane Creek Elementary, K-5 (Forest Heights)	2	32	35.2	27.2	**16.7**	**17.4**	**25**	**42.6**	**37**	**36**	18.1	15	17
Gibbes Middle, 6-8	2	49	49.9	49.2	11.3	8.4	9.1	**68.8**	**62.7**	**50**	**4.1**	**6.3**	**11**
Sarah Nance Elementary, K-5 (Watkins Nance)	2	NA	41.9	38.2	NA	**8.4**	**17.2**	NA	51.2	49	**NA**	**9.5**	**15**
Myles W. Whitlock Jr. High, 7-9	2	48.3	55.6	56.5	9.9	5.4	7	**56.4**	**51.7**	**49**	**8.2**	**11.3**	**15**
Mayewood Middle, 6-8	2	39.8	51.8	48.7	15.2	5.3	8.9	43	45.6		9.8	10.9	
Battery Park Elementary, K-8	2	**31.3**	**41.1**	**17.3**	**11.3**	**12.6**	**27.2**	**34.4**	**25.3**	**14**	**10.6**	**14.7**	**35**
Allendale Elementary, K-5	3		58.4	50.6		**4.8**	**13.3**	**63.4**	**53.2**	**44**	**0.3**	**4.8**	**9**
Fairfax Elementary, K-6	3	33.7	42	36.7	17.9	14.9	22.5	**43.7**	**34.4**	**31**	16.3	15.6	13
Scotts Branch Elem/Middle, 6-7	3	43	53.3		12.5	6.3		52.2			7.7		
West Hardeeville Elementary, K-3	3	46.4	55.2	50.1	13.1	7	2.3	**60.6**	**53.5**	**48**	8.2	8.3	9
Cleveland Elementary, K-6	3	49.8	61.9	50.4	**9.7**	**9.3**	**14.7**	**51.2**	**48.1**	**42**	11.7	9.4	16
St. Paul Primary, K-3	Other	**28.4**	**17.1**	**11.3**	17.3	40.8	4.2	**38.3**	**28.9**	**26**	9.9	19.7	12

School	Initial Tier	PACT English language arts						PACT Mathematics					
		percent Below Basic			percent Proficient or Advanced			percent Below Basic			percent Proficient or Advanced		
		2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004	2002	2003	2004
Johnson Middle, 6-8	Other		60.8	44.4		7.9	11		**57.9**	**40**		**7.9**	**18**
Ridgeland Elementary, K-4	Other	38	34.8	33.3	**20.3**	**18.9**	**28**	**47.7**	**34.3**	**38**	15.2	20.1	18
Bishopville Primary, K-3	Other	37.7	35.2	40.5	14.9	22.4	3.4	**44**	**35.4**	**28**	**11.2**	**16.5**	**30**
West Lee Elementary, K-6	Other	38.4	35.3	42.5	19.6	15.1	15.8	**44.9**	**31.1**	**39**	16.7	20.2	17
Rains Centenary /Pleasant Grove, K-6	Other	45.7	57	49.40	10.5	9.3	10.1	36.8	40.5	50	**12.3**	**11.8**	**5**

Some findings bear consideration:

- As is evident in statewide data, elementary and middle schools, regardless of tier assignment, were more likely to make and sustain gains in mathematics than in English language arts.
- As is evident in statewide data, elementary and middle schools, regardless of tier assignment, were more likely to reduce the percentage of students scoring Below Basic than they were to increase the percentage of students scoring Proficient or Advanced.
- Tier Two schools were more likely than schools in other tiers to demonstrate improvements in both mathematics and English language arts.
- Within Tier Two schools, those with teacher specialists assigned demonstrated more gains than those not assigned teacher specialists (although the schools may have had other personnel under the tiered system).
- Only a small group of schools have sufficient numbers of students scoring Proficient or Advanced in either content area to satisfy the federal Adequate Yearly Progress requirement.

Table 3
2002 and 2003 Tenth Grade Student Performance on BSAP Exit Examination
High Schools Assigned Teacher Specialists Compared within Tier of Services

School	Tier	Reading Subtest		Mathematics Subtest		Writing Subtest		All Subtests	
		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003
Estill High	1	76.2	60.0	60.3	58.7	61.9	48.6	39.7	29.3
Timmonsville Educ. Ctr	2	64.4	63	57.6	72.1	72.4	45	49.2	32.8
Elloree High	2	75	68.6	76.7	88.2	68.3	72.5	55	54.9
Bowman High	2	69.1	70.3	65.5	78.4	58.2	67.6	50	56.8
Allendale-Fairfax High	Other	55.8	62.3	63.4	74.6	61.4	54.2	37.1	39
Denmark-Olar High	Other	60	78.5	58	60	60	64.6	38	44.8
Scotts Branch High	Other	56.3	78.2	57.7	67.9	81.4	84.4	38	59.5
Jasper High	Other	67.4	59.6	61.3	55.5	64	58.2	41.3	36.3
Lee High	Other	64.7	60.9	59.2	62.9	62.5	46.3	41.8	32.9
Terrells Bay	Other	Combined with Brittons Neck to form Creek Bridge							

Table 4
2004 Tenth Grade Performance on HSAP Exit Examination
High Schools Assigned Teacher Specialists Compared within Tier of Service

School	Tier	Passed one subtest	Passed both subtests
Estill High	1	29.0%	44.9%
Timmonsville Educ. Ctr	2	14.6%	63.4%
Elloree High	2	9.1%	63.6%
Bowman High	2	18.5%	63%
Allendale-Fairfax High	Other	20.6%	58.8%
Denmark-Olar High	Other	18,8%	72.5%
Scotts Branch High	Other	21.7%	51.9%
Jasper High	Other	25.3%	48.8%
Lee High	Other	24.3%	55.3%
Terrells Bay	Other	16.7%	62.5%

Performance on the High School Assessment Program (HSAP) should be followed over time to determine patterns in student achievement and the impact of technical assistance. Studies should explore reasons why a dramatically higher percentage of students passed all requirements on first attempt and determine if the rise is a function of instruction or differences between the two tests.

A second way of exploring student achievement gains is to examine the differences in the absolute indices that are calculated based upon the ratings criteria and collapsed into the categories defined by statute. The absolute indices for the schools in this study are displayed in Table 5. Differences in these indices are used for determining if a school has met the SBE prescribed measure of expected progress. The expected progress measure is based upon a change in a school's absolute index of .3 over a two-year period. The data presented below indicate that a minority of schools in Tiers One or Three and the Other category would have made expected progress for the years 2001-2003 or 2002-2004. Tier Two schools are more successful.

A significant number of schools do show higher absolute indices over time and this progress should not be discounted. As is evident in the three student achievement analyses, some progress is being made and those involved should be congratulated. This progress, however, falls short of goals for individuals, groups of students or for the state to attain the levels of student achievement necessary for individuals or the state to be economically competitive in the twenty-first century.

Table 5
Absolute Indices of Schools in Teacher Specialist Study

District	School	2001	2002	2003	2004
TIER ONE					
Allendale	Allendale-Fairfax Middle	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2
Charleston	Clyde Sanders Elementary	2.1	2.2	2	2.3
Charleston	Rivers Middle	2	1.9	1.9	2.0
Hampton 2	Estill High	1.7	1.3	1.9	2.3
Hampton 2	Estill High	1.6	1.9	2.1	NA
Hampton 2	Estill Middle	2	2.1	2.1	2.2
Jasper	Ridgeland Middle	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.0
Lee	Dennis Intermediate	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.3
Lee	Fleming Intermediate	1.9	2.2	closed	NA
Lee	Mount Pleasant Middle	1.6	2	2	2.0
Richland 1	W A Perry Middle	2	2.1	2.1	2.0
TIER TWO					
Anderson 5	South Fant Street Elementary	2.3	2.4	2.8	closed
Bamberg 2	Denmark-Olar Middle	2	2.2	2.3	2.5
Bamberg 2	Denmark-Olar Elementary	2.5	2.5	2.3	2.4
Beaufort	Whale Branch Elementary	2	2.2	2.2	2.3
Beaufort	Whale Branch Middle	2	2.1	2.2	2.4
Charleston	Brentwood Middle	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8
Charleston	Edmund A Burns Elementary	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.6
Charleston	Mary Ford Elementary	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.4
Charleston	R D Schroder Middle	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.4

District	School	2001	2002	2003	2004
Clarendon 1	Scott s Branch Intermediate	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.3
Clarendon 1	Scott s Branch Intermediate	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.4
Darlington	Spaulding Elementary	2	2.3	2.4	2.5
Dillon 2	J V Martin Junior High	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.3
Florence 4	Timmonsville High	2.2	2.0	2.4	2.4
Florence 4	Brockington Elementary	2.2	2.6	2.5	2.5
Greenville	Hollis Academy	2.2	2.2	2	2.2
Greenville	Monaview Elementary	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.6
Greenville	Parker Middle	2	2.1	1.9	1.7
Hampton 2	Estill Elementary	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.8
Lee	Lower Lee Elementary	2.2	1.8	2.1	2.4
Marboro	Bennettsville Middle	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.0
Orangeburg 3	Holly Hill Middle	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.4
Orangeburg 3	Elloree High	1.4	1.6	2.0	3.0
Orangeburg 3	Elloree High	2	2.1	2	2.3
Orangeburg 3	Elloree Elementary	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.7
Orangeburg 5	Bowman High	2	2	2.3	2.4
Orangeburg 5	Bowman High	1.4	1.3	2	3.2
Orangeburg 5	Robert E Howard Middle	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.4
Orangeburg 5	Brookdale Middle	2	2.2	closed	NA
Richland 1	Alcorn Middle	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2
Richland 1	Gibbes Middle	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.2
Richland 1	Watkins-Nance Elementary	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.5
Richland 1	Forest Heights Elementary	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.8
Spartanburg 7	Myles W Whitlock Junior High	1.9	2.2	2.1	2.2
Sumter 2	Mayewood Middle	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.4
Williamsburg	Battery Park Elementary	2.4	2.4	NA	NA
Williamsburg	Battery Park Elementary	2.6	2.7	2.7	3.2
TIER THREE					
Allendale	Allendale Elementary	2	2.1	2.1	2.4
Allendale	Fairfax Elementary	2.4	2.6	2.6	2.6
Clarendon 1	Scott s Branch Intermediate	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.3
Clarendon 1	Scott s Branch Intermediate	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.4
Darlington	West Hartsville Elementary	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5
Spartanburg 7	Cleveland Elementary	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.4
OTHER					
Allendale	Allendale-Fairfax High	1.6	1.4	1.2	2.5
Bamberg 2	Denmark-Olar High	1.0	1.4	1.2	1.8
Clarendon 1	Scotts Branch High	1.9	1.6	2.9	2.8
Clarendon 1	Scotts Branch High	2.2	2	NA	NA
Florence 4	Johnson Middle	2	2	2.1	2.4
Jasper	Jasper County High	1.3	1.3	1.6	2.9
Jasper	Ridgeland Elementary	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.7
Lee	Bishopville Primary	2.7	2.3	2.6	3.0
Lee	Lee Central High	NA	NA	1.6	2.2
Lee	West Lee Elementary	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.6
Marion 7	Rains-Centenary/Pleasant Grove	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.3
Clarendon 1	St. Paul Primary	2.6	2.6	3	2.9
Marion 7	Terrell s Bay High	1.7	1.9	merged	NA
Marion 7	Terrell s Bay High	2.2	2	2	NA

A third way to examine student achievement is to explore changes in the school ratings. Having the same rating is problematic finding for these schools.

Table 6
Changes in Absolute Ratings
across School Years 2000-2001 through 2003-2004
Schools in Teacher Specialist on Site Study by Tier

Years Compared: 2001 through 2004	Same Ratings Both 2001 & 2004		Higher Ratings in 2004 Compared to 2001		Lower Ratings in 2004 Compared to 2001		Total
Tier One	6	67%	3	33%			9
Tier Two	15	48%	13	42%	3	10%	31
Tier Three	4	80%	1	20%			5
Other	7	58%	5	42%			12
Column Totals	32	56%	22	39%	3	5%	57

NOTE: Data from schools closed during the years under study are excluded.

Table 7
Ratings of Schools Receiving Teacher Specialists on Site
2001, 2002 and 2003

SCHOOL	ABSOLUTE RATING				IMPROVEMENT RATING			
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001	2002	2003	2004
TIER ONE								
Allendale Fairfax Middle, 7-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Excellent	Average	Below Average	Good
MR Rivers Middle, 6-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Clyde Sanders Elementary, K-5	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Good
Estill High, 8-12	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Average	Excellent
Estill Middle, 5-7	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Good	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Good
Ridgeland Middle, 5-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Dennis/Bishopville Intermediate	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Combined with grade 6 school	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Combine with grade 6 school	Below Average
Fleming Intermediate, 4-6	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	CLOSED		Below Average	Average	CLOSED	
Closed Mt. Pleasant Middle, 7-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Good	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
WA Perry Middle, 6-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
TIER TWO								
South Fant St. Elementary, K-5	Below Average	Below Average	Average	CLOSED	Below Average	Below Average	Average	CLOSED
Denmark Olar Elementary, K-5	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average
Denmark-Olar Middle, 7-8	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Good	Below Average	Good
Whale Branch Elementary, K-5	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average
Whale Branch Middle, 6-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Below Average	Average
Mary Ford Elementary, K-5	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Good	Good	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Edmund Burns Elementary, K-5	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Good	Below Average	Below Average	Good
Brentwood Middle, 6-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
RD Schroder Middle, 6-8	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Average	Average	Unsatisfactory
Scotts Branch Elem/Middle, 4-5	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Spaulding Elem4-6	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Average	Average	Below Average
JV Martin, 7-9	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Brockington Elementary, K-5	Below Average	Average	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory

SCHOOL	ABSOLUTE RATING				IMPROVEMENT RATING			
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001	2002	2003	2004
Timmonsville Educ. Center, 9-12	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Excellent	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average
Hollis Elementary, K-5	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Good	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average
Monaview Elementary, K-5	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Average
Parker Middle, 6-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average
Estill Elementary, K-4	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Good	Unsatisfactory	Average	Average
Lower Lee Elementary, K-3	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Good
Bennettsville Middle, 6-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Average
Elloree Elementary, K-6	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Average	Average	Unsatisfactory	Average	Below Average
Elloree High, 7-12	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Good	Average	Good	Below Average
Holly Hill Middle, 6-8	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Good	Below Average	Below Average	Average
Brookdale Middle, 5-8	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	CLOSED		Unsatisfactory	Good	CLOSED	
Robert Howard Middle, 5-8	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Good
Bowman Middle/High, 6-12	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Excellent	Average
Alcorn Middle, 6-8	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average
Forest Heights Elementary, K-5	New school in 2002	Average	Average	Average	New school in 2002	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average
Gibbes Middle, 6-8	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average
Watkins Nance Elementary, K-5	Below Average	Combined to form a new school in 2002	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Combined to form a new school in 2002	Unsatisfactory	Below Average
Myles W. Whitlock Jr. High, 7-9	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Average	Unsatisfactory	Average
Mayewood Middle, 6-8	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Average	Unsatisfactory	Average
Battery Park Elementary, K-8	Average	Average	Average	Good	Unsatisfactory	Average	Below Average	Excellent
TIER THREE								
Allendale Elementary, K-5	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Fairfax Elementary, K-6	Below Average	Average	Average	Below Average	Excellent	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory
Scotts Branch Elementary	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
West Hardeeville Elementary, K-3	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Average	Average	Good
Cleveland Elementary, K-6	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average

SCHOOL	ABSOLUTE RATING				IMPROVEMENT RATING			
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001	2002	2003	2004
OTHER								
Allendale Fairfax High, 9-12	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Excellent
Denmark-Olar High, 9-12	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Excellent	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Scotts Branch High, 8-12	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Average	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Excellent	Unsatisfactory
St. Paul Primary, K-3	Average	Average	Good	Average	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Excellent	Not rated
Johnson Middle, 6-8	Unsatisfactory	Merged with Timmonsville Middle	Unsatisfactory	Below Average	Below Average	Merged with Timmonsville Middle	Below Average	Average
Jasper County High, 9-12	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Average	Below Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Excellent
Ridgeland Elementary, K-4	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Average	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Average	Unsatisfactory
Bishopville Primary, K-3	Average	Below Average	Average	Average	Average	Unsatisfactory	Good	Not rated
Lee Central High, 11-12	Not rated	Not rated	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Not rated	Not rated	Not rated	Excellent
West Lee Elementary, K-6	Below Average	Average	Average	Below Average	Average	Good	Average	Average
Rains Centenary /Pleasant Grove, K-6	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Below Average	Average	Average	Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Terrells Bay High, 7-12	Below Average	Unsatisfactory	Combined with another school		Below Average	Average	Combined with another school	

Several observations emerge from examining the data:

- Maintaining a particular absolute rating is not positive for the schools in this study, although maintenance may be positive for schools not assigned technical assistance.
- Tier One schools, beginning with the lowest indices, exhibit the greatest struggle in improving. In fact, only three of nine earned a higher absolute rating.
- Less than half of Tier One schools earned an improvement rating of Good or Excellent.
- Tier Two schools were most likely to earn higher ratings, although six maintained performance at the Unsatisfactory level.
- Within Tier Two, those schools assigned teacher specialists tended to show more growth than those not assigned teacher specialists despite the presence of other technical assistance personnel.
- Improvement ratings for Tier Two schools suggest that while one-year cohort performance is improving, significant numbers of students also are gaining academic strength relative to the performance expectations of the next grade.
- Tier Three schools demonstrated significant stability in absolute ratings, with only one of the five schools elevating its rating.
- Only one Tier Three school earned an improvement rating of Good; three of the five schools earned an Unsatisfactory improvement ratings, again indicating that students are not gaining academic strength relative to the performance expectations of the next grade.
- Five of twelve schools in the Other category demonstrated improvements in their absolute ratings, four elevated their improvement rating.
- Schools elevating their ratings typically only elevated it one category (i.e., from Unsatisfactory to Below Average).

Are there changes in the school community and/or culture during the years with teacher specialists?

Three sources of information are used to determine changes in the school community or culture: administrator and teacher turnover rates, summary data from the teacher, student and parent evaluations of the school, and information from the surveys administered by the USC Education Policy Center. Administrator and faculty stability correlate positively with school ratings and higher levels of student performance. The "Teachers Returning" factor is an average over three years while the administrator factor report years in the current assignment. Table 8 showcases the summary data by tier.

The data indicate minor increases in administrator stability over the three years for schools in Tier Two, although the teacher turnover rate dropped back to the 2001 level. Tier One schools are impacted most by turnover and, as the achievement data indicate, have shown the least improvement.

Table 8
Summary of Administrative Years at the School and Teachers Returning By Tier

Factor	2001 Mean	2002 Mean	2003 Mean	2004 Mean
Administrator Years at the school				
Tier 1: Adm. Years	3	2	2.8	1.9
Tier 2: Adm. Years	2	2.5	2.7	3.1
Tier 3: Adm. Years	2	2.0**	3.0	1.8
Other: Adm. .Years	0	2.4	2.2	2.9
Teachers Returning				
Tier 1: Teachers Returning	69.7%t	61%	64.7%	68.2
Tier 2: Teachers Returning	65.5%	75.8%	76.7%	65.8
Tier 3: Teachers Returning	77.1%t	75.7%	78.2%	81.5
Other: Teachers Returning	63.1%	75.9%**	75.1%	71.5

NOTES: *Rounded to nearest tenth
**There may be variations from data presented earlier in the First Year Formative Report and the Second Year Formative Report because of school closings and mergers between 2002 and 2003.

Each year in accordance with the requirements for the annual school report card all teachers and students at selected grade levels are surveyed to determine their evaluations of the schools. Parents were surveyed beginning in 2003. The surveys include approximately 40 items across three dimensions. Only summary data are published on the school report card, but the item responses are available to the school and district.

Table 9
Teacher and Student Evaluations of the School: Mean Percentage Satisfied

FACTOR	Teacher Satisfaction				Student Satisfaction				Parent Satisfaction		
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001	2002	2003	2004	Not administered	2003	2004
Learning Environment											
Tier 1	52	48.1	50.8	48.3	62.7	65.2	60	57.4		59.1	57.4
Tier 2	64.1	65.7	70.3	65.9	67.8	72.1	73.2	70		74.8	74
Tier 3	33.1	66.6	63.5	63.3	65.1	73.2	69.8	78.4		71.2	64.1
Other	57.1	71.1	65.5	73.4	50.4	65.1	70.7	66.9		72.2	73.5
Social and Physical Environment											
Tier 1	59.7	56.8	57.6	57.6	65.1	66.8	59.6	66.2		55.7	51.2
Tier 2	69.1	72.5	74.7	71.2	69.5	71.6	74.5	70.2		66.7	67.6
Tier 3	40.3	70	58.8	58.4	67.7	73.4	69.2	75.6		72.1	62.3
Other	65.6	72.2	77.4	75.7	54.8	68.4	70.5	69		63.6	60.8
Home School Relations											
Tier 1	36.3	26.5	23.9	31.1	78.3	83	79.2	76.7		51	57.2
Tier 2	36.1	33.9	34.6	33	81	84.2	83.2	82.1		68.4	65.7
Tier 3	19.3	39.4	40.6	29.1	84.3	85.4	76.6	81.6		72.%	67.1
Other	36.6	41.2	39.5	37.5	65.2	78	82.9	82.3		66	68.1

*NOTE: Rounded to nearest tenth

The teacher specialist program is but one factor that has the potential to influence the school culture. Other factors including the district administration, the principal, the faculty, parents and community also contribute. The striking difference in success for Tier Two schools compared to Tier One schools raise questions about the need for more intensive strategies in the latter group of schools; the strategies should address the deep social and economic disadvantages.

How has the teacher specialist program impacted upon the instructional skills and professional growth of the teachers involved?

The 2002 and 2003 survey data indicate that teachers believe the teacher specialist program has had a significant impact on their instructional skills and professional growth. This is most evident among teachers early in their careers and in settings with local administrative understanding and support. Two factors bear consideration when responding to this issue: first, the percentage of teachers impacted may be greater than is apparent in the school results, as the high teacher turnover rate is evidence of teachers working in other settings subsequent to receiving training from the teacher specialist and second, that while the school results indicate some improvement there is not evidence that student growth is maintained over time as measured by the improvement ratings.

How has the program functioned over time?

As has been detailed earlier in this report, the teacher specialist program has undergone a number of changes from the model as strictly defined in the statute. Unable to employ and place sufficient number of teacher specialists, the SDE received permission and implemented a tiered approach. The tiers incorporate the use of several technical assistance personnel who are assigned in differing combinations to schools rated Unsatisfactory or Below Average. Over the three years of this evaluation, the positions and combinations have changed as the SDE responded to a growing group of schools identified for technical assistance.

With experience and data from studies, the SDE modified the recruitment, training and responsibilities for individuals serving as teacher specialists.

The degree of local ownership of the teacher specialists is a continuing source of concern. Accepted into many schools as a part of the local team, the teacher specialist program becomes vulnerable to building expectations that the individuals will always be at the school and in some small schools to overwhelming the local leadership. Yet, as the survey data document, when the teacher specialists are perceived as symbols of top-down state influence on the school, they are less effective. Policymakers and administrators are challenged to create conditions in which external assistance is welcomed but local administrators are able to build capacity.

The teacher specialist program has not been accepted universally. Very early in its implementation, some policymakers began to call for strategies that focus more on local capacity development. With support from the State Superintendent of Education, four schools received permission to use the Teacher Advancement Program in lieu of the teacher specialist program. The SDE contracted with Edison Schools to provide services in Allendale County Schools to supplement the teacher specialist program. And finally, the SDE and Education Oversight Committee approved criteria for an alternative technical assistance program. The alternative program allows schools to employ a strategy that conforms to principles identified in comprehensive school reform models in lieu of the teacher specialist program. Those criteria are available in the appendix.

What are the unintended consequences of the teacher specialist program?

At least five unintended consequences can be identified: (1) the inclusion of teacher specialist salary supplements in the calculation of the southeastern average teacher salary skews the average teacher salary toward a small group of teachers, rather than the entire teacher population; (2) although there are not data to support the claim, school administrators continue to express concerns that the best teachers are pulled away from schools, resulting in weaker performance in the schools contributing teacher specialists; (3) the assignment of individuals to teacher specialist roles within their home district contradicts the premises supporting the salary supplement (i.e., teacher specialists are compensated for the inconvenience of traveling to another district or school and that the local community does not have the capacity to address problems in its schools; (4) the inability to place teacher specialists or other assistance personnel in some schools deepens the isolation of those schools from the improvement efforts; and (5) the high teacher turnover rate in the target

schools results in the teacher specialist functions serving as a professional development program for schools and districts not targeted for technical assistance.

PART V

Conclusions and Recommendations

As is evident from its commitment over time to the principles of educational accountability and accolades from external groups, South Carolina remains a leader in school improvement. The state, challenged by the transition to a global economy, has no alternative but to reinforce the quality of instruction provided in its schools so that all students succeed. But that instruction is provided to students who must contend with strong social, economic, health and other disadvantages daily. Too many young people lack access to the prerequisites of successful school learning.

The SDE is to be commended on its commitment to the program and the task before it. The agency has initiated a program more comprehensive than any other state's technical assistance strategy and, as annual data and experiences indicated, modified the program.

The General Assembly of South Carolina is to be commended for its continuing financial support for the program despite a number of years with revenue reductions and for its willingness to permit modifications to the model outlined in statute.

The teacher specialist program is grounded in the coaching model and struggles to implement the program in South Carolina mirror struggles nationally with the coaching model. Over the program years, the SDE has received substantial funding and legislative latitude to implement the program in schools demonstrating the most significant needs. In circumstances such as those present in Tier Two schools (i.e., those in need of assistance but not at the lowest performance level) the impact of the teacher specialist program in combination with other resources has been positive. The program has contributed to gains in schools in which teacher specialists have been assigned; in those schools designated to receive teacher specialists but not assigned teacher specialists the gains have not been realized. These gains are evident in test scores, indices and ratings. The SDE has chosen to customize the program to school settings in order to gain the greatest benefit from the assistance personnel available. This customization runs somewhat counter to advice from national resources on program fidelity and confounds the ability of any evaluation study to define program elements that contribute most to success and should be replicated in other settings. Customization implies that a model is adapted to in response to a particular environment or intensity of challenges that may differ from one setting to another—essentially flexibility within a structure. The ultimate dilemma of this evaluation is that the structure of the technical assistance program (defined by the SDE as a leadership model implementing best practices) has not been detailed so that the areas in which flexibility benefits the student and school can be identified, validated and replicated in other settings. Future studies should explore the interaction among the technical assistance personnel at all schools receiving assistance. Larger sample sizes and more sophisticated statistical methodologies (e.g., MANOVA or Path analyses) may be sensitive to changes.

Services by other types of technical assistance personnel (e.g., district instructional facilitator, curriculum specialist) are more likely to be part of the administrative team. Future studies should explore the degree to which relational trust in those configurations equals the trust achieved through the teacher specialist program.

The teacher specialist model is a viable option to improve instruction in a school; data presented in this report offer documentation of circumstances in which the model is successful as evidenced in improvements in student achievement and/or school ratings. The model, however, has not gained the widespread confidence of practitioners or policymakers who are not direct recipients of the program. Some argue that the model drains local school districts of their best teachers, despite data to the contrary. Others suggest that the work of teacher specialists is not prescribed sufficiently so that they are vulnerable to becoming quasi-administrators; others claim that the teacher specialists'

time is overly controlled by the SDE. The SDE and Education Oversight Committee support alternative models to build capacity at the local level so that technical assistance is not needed again. State Superintendent Inez Tenenbaum promotes the use of the Teacher Advancement Program as an alternative to the teacher specialist model in appropriate settings and has contracted with Edison Schools to deliver supplemental services in Allendale schools.

A number of recommendations arise from this review and are offered below:

(1) The teacher specialist program should be defined clearly so that the particular strategies and practices are understood and there is evidence of faithful and reliable implementation by all program participants across all sites. While the need for customization is understood, the program is vulnerable to personal interpretations and misalignment.
(2) The teacher specialist program should be examined to determine if there are ways in which the program can contribute to the development of local capacity that sustains higher achievement beyond the years of state support.
(3) A single line of authority and responsibility should be defined so that the program supports development of local capacity and ownership and there is no confusion between technical assistance and state management.
(4) The teacher specialist program should employ the use of the improvement ratings in addition to expected progress measures to ensure that individual students are benefiting as they move through school.
(5) Those responsible for the teacher specialist program should explore the criteria for the alternative technical assistance program and use them as guidelines for future program development.
(6) The teacher specialist program should be coordinated with other program improvement efforts provided through federal, state or local authority. Inconsistencies should be addressed at the policy and administrative levels, rather than left to the teacher specialist or teacher to resolve.
(7) Easily understood materials should be developed to encourage understanding of the teacher specialist program and those situations in which it is effective by broader constituencies so that the program attracts supporters.
(8) The SDE should be provided adequate resources so that teacher specialists can be supported in their assignments and that local support can be nurtured.

APPENDICES

A. Assignment of Teacher Specialists

B. Procedural Guidelines to Determine Satisfactory Implementation of Approved Recommendations and Expected Progress

C. Strategy for Placing On Site Personnel for 2003-04 School Year

D. Criteria for Alternative Technical Assistance Program

APPENDIX A

Assignments of Teacher Specialists 2001–2002, 2002–2003, 2003–2004
and
Ratios of Teacher Specialists to Teachers Served

District	School	Tier	2001–02 TS Placed	2002–03 TS Placed	2002–03 Total Teachers	2002–03 Ratio of TS to Total Teachers	2003–04 TS Placed	2003–04 Ratio of TS to Teachers Served
TIER ONE								
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax Middle, 7-8	1	3	2	28	1:14	2	1:6
Charleston	MR Rivers Middle, 6-8	1	2	3	28	1:9.3	1	1:4
Charleston	Clyde Sanders Elem., K-5	1	3	5	20	7	6	1:3.33
Hampton 2	Estill High, 8-12	1	0	1	35	0	2	1:8
Hampton 2	Estill Middle, 5-7	1	1	2	26	1:13	3	1:3
Jasper	Ridgeland Middle, 5-8	1	3	3	35	1:11.7	3	1:5
Lee	Dennis Intermediate, 4-6 (formerly Bishopville Intermediate, 6)	1	4	4	38	1:9.5	2	1:14.5
Lee	Fleming Intermediate	1	2	4	Closed			
Lee	Mt. Pleasant Middle	1	3	3	0	0	0	0
Richland 1	WA Perry Middle	1	2	2	33	1:16.5	3	1:7
TIER TWO								
Anderson 5	South Fant Street	2	3	1	28	1:28	0	NP
Bamberg 2	Denmark Olar Elementary	2	4	2	45	1:22.5	0	NP
Bamberg 2	Denmark Olar Middle	2	3	3	21	1:7	2	1:3
Beaufort	Whale Branch Elementary	2	2	5	37	1:7.4	4	1:6.25
Beaufort	Whale Branch Middle	2	0	1	39	1:39	3	1:9
Charleston	Mary Ford Elementary	2	1	6	36	1:6	6	1:7.16
Charleston	Edmund Burns Elementary	2	3	3	46	1:15	0	NP
Charleston	Brentwood Middle	2	0	2	56	1:28	3	1:7
Charleston	RD Schroder Middle	2	1	0	22	No placement	0	NP
Clarendon 1	Scotts Branch Elem/Middle	2	2	2	26	1:13	0	NP
Darlington	Spaulding Elementary	2	3	3	19	1:6.3	3	1:6.0
Dillon 2	JV Martin Middle	2	0	3	37	1:12.3	1	1:5
Florence 4	Brockington Elementary	2	6	6	43	1:7.1	0	NP
Florence 4	Timmonsville Education Center	2	6	0	30	No placement	0	NP
Greenville	Hollis Elementary	2	2	2	57	1:28.5	0	NP
Greenville	Monaview Elementary	2	2	0	39	No placement	0	NP
Greenville	Parker Middle	2	3	3	34	1:11.3	3	1:8
Hampton 2	Estill Elementary	2	0	1	41	1:41	3	1:7
Lee	Lower Lee Elementary	2	4	3	21	1:7	6	1:4.33
Marlboro	Bennettsville Middle	2	0	0	34	No placement	0	NP
Orangeburg 3	Elloree Elementary	2	0	1	34	1:34	0	NP
Orangeburg 3	Elloree High	2	1	4	37	1:9	4	1:6
Orangeburg 3	Holly Hill Middle	2	0	0	43	No placement	0	NP
Orangeburg 5	Brookdale Middle	2	Closed					
Orangeburg 5	Rob. Howard Middle	2	1	3	44	1:14.7	3	1:11
Orangeburg 5	Bowman Middle/High	2	1	4	36	1:9	4	1:8.75
Richland 1	Alcorn Middle	2	3	2	52	1:26	3	1:8
Richland 1	Crane Creek/Forest Heights	2	6	0	46	No placement	0	NP
Richland 1	Gibbes Middle	2	0	0	46	No placement	3	1:6
Richland 1	Watkins-Nance Elementary	2	6	0	36	No placement	0	NP
Spartanburg 7	Whitlock Jr. High	2	2	3	52	1:17.3	1	1:13
Sumter 2	Mayewood Middle	2	3	1	20	1:20	0	NP
Williamsburg	Battery Park Elementary	2	5	0	15	No placement	0	NP

TIER THREE								
Allendale	Allendale Elementary	3	3	6	45	1:7.5	6	1:7.7
Allendale	Fairfax Elementary	3	5	6	29	1:4.8	6	1:5.5
10Clarendon 1	Scotts Branch Elementary	3	3	2	26	1:13	0	NP
Jasper	West Hardeeville Elementary	3	1	8	61	1:7.6	7	8:71
Spartanburg 7	Cleveland Elementary	3	1	1	39	1:39	0	NP
OTHER								
Allendale	Allendale Fairfax High	Other	3	3	48	1:16	4	1:6
Bamberg 2	Denmark Olar High	Other	1	2	27	1:13.5	3	1:6
Clarendon 1	Scotts Branch High	Other	3	3	30	1:10	2	1:7
Lee	St Paul Primary	Other	4	0	26	No placement	0	NP
Florence 4	Johnson Middle	Other	3	3	19	1:6.3	3	1:4
Jasper	Jasper County High	Other	2	2	40	1:20	2	1:11
Jasper	Ridgeland Elementary	Other	2	0	64	No placement	0	NP
Lee	Bishopville Primary	Other	3	0	44	No placement	0	NP
Lee	Lee Central High	Other	2	0	58	No placement	0	NP
Lee	West Lee Elementary	Other	6	3	21	1:7	0	NP
Marion 7	Rains/Centenary Elementary	Other	7	2	23	1:11.5	0	NP
Marion 7	Terrells Bay/Creek Bridge High	Other	4	3	19	2002 –2003 Ratio of TS to Total Teachers	1	1:7.5

Source: South Carolina State Department of Education, 2002, 2003 and 2004.

APPENDIX B

Procedural Guidelines to Determine Satisfactory Implementation of Approved Recommendations and Expected Progress

S.C. Code Ann.§ 59-18-1520 (2004) establishes broad guidelines for dealing with schools that do not implement SBE recommendations or show progress once identified as unsatisfactory. The law grants authority to the State Superintendent of Education to intervene with State Board of Education approval when A) satisfactory implementation of approved recommendations has not occurred according to the timeline developed by the State Board of Education or B) student academic performance has not met expected progress.

The criteria and procedures below will be used to define the satisfactory implementation of identified recommendations and expected progress.

Procedures for Monitoring Satisfactory Implementation of Recommendations and Plans

The following procedures will be implemented to determine if A) the External Review Team's recommendations approved by the State Board of Education, B) the district's plan, and C) the school's revised plan have been satisfactorily implemented according to timeline developed by State Board of Education.

- An external review committee will be appointed by the Department of Education to review the approved prior years external review team's recommendation's, the district's strategic plan, and the school's revised plan.

- The committee will be composed of at least three members, and should include members of the prior year's external review team.

- The committee will conduct an on-site review of the school to include all facets of school operations.

Beginning in 2004–05 the External Review Team visits will determine whether the implementation of recommendations and plans was satisfactory. If the committee determines that satisfactory implementation did not take place, the following steps will be taken.

- The State Superintendent of Education will meet with designated Department of Education staff, representative(s) from the most recent External Review Team that visited the school, and a representative of the local School Improvement Council to consider the most appropriate course of action.

- The district superintendent, school principal, and members of the local school board must appear before the State Board and may outline reasons why a state of emergency should not be declared in the school.

- The State Superintendent will select any of the following actions and present them to the State Board of Education for approval:

  (1) furnish continuing advice and technical assistance in implementing the recommendations of the State Board of Education;

(2) declare a state of emergency in the school and replace the school's principal; or
(3) declare a state of emergency in the school and assume management of the school.

- The State Board must approve the recommendation(s) of the State Superintendent before implementation.

Procedures for Monitoring Expected Progress

Beginning with the November 2003 report card, any school that receives an absolute report card rating of unsatisfactory will be monitored to determine if expected progress is being met.
Both of the following criteria must be met to demonstrate expected progress.

Criterion One: Attain a minimum absolute value of 1.8 and
Criterion Two: A) Increase the school's absolute value .3 of a point, <u>or</u>
B) Improve the absolute rating at least one level.

Schools must continue to increase .3 of a point for each two-year period until the absolute rating is higher than the unsatisfactory category.

- Since report card ratings released in November of each year are based on the prior year's data, the initial application of the two-year gain of .3 point is made on the absolute value calculated for the third report card following the unsatisfactory rating. This allows the school two full instructional years with the technical assistance provided through the Department of Education to impact student achievement. The first monitoring of schools rated as unsatisfactory on the November 2003 report card will use the absolute value from the 2006 report card.

- Schools that meet both criterion one and criterion two will meet expected progress for the first monitoring period.

- Schools must continue to gain .3 point every two years, or until they improve the absolute rating at least one level.

- Monitoring will cease once a school has attained an absolute rating higher than the unsatisfactory category for two consecutive years.

Declaration of State of Emergency
S.C. Code Ann. § 59-18-1520 (2004)

Section 59-18-1520. If the recommendations approved by the state board, the district's plan, or the school's revised plan is not satisfactorily implemented by the school rated unsatisfactory and its school district according to the time line developed by the State Board of Education or if student academic performance has not met expected progress, the principal, district superintendent, and members of the board of trustees must appear before the State Board of Education to outline the reasons why a state of emergency should not be declared in the school. The state superintendent, after consulting with the external review committee and with the approval of the State Board of Education, shall be granted the authority to take any of the following actions:

(1) furnish continuing advice and technical assistance in implementing the recommendations of the State Board of Education;

(2) declare a state of emergency in the school and replace the school's principal; or

(3) declare a state of emergency in the school and assume management of the school.

The chart below provides several examples of expected progress. The numbers indicate the school's absolute value. Those numbers that are **bold** indicate that the school did not meet expected progress.

Instructional Year	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Year Report Card Published	November 2003	November 2004	November 2005	November 2006	November 2007	November 2008	November 2009	November 2010	November 2011
Maximum Unsatisfactory Value	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9
School One	1.8	1.7	2.1	**2.0**					
School Two	1.8	1.7	2.1	2.2	2.3	**2.4**			
School Three	1.8	1.7	2.1	2.2	2.6	2.7			
School Four	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.2	**2.3**				

School One–did not meet the gain of .3 in 2006 when compared to the 2003 absolute value. External Review Committee appointed with findings due by spring of 2007. If school one does not meet satisfactory implementation requirements as determined by the external review committee, appearance before the State Board of Education is required.

School Two–met expected progress in first monitoring period going from 1.8 to 2.2. However, did not continue to gain .3 points in second monitoring period in 2008. External Review Committee appointed with findings due by spring of 2008. If school two does not meet satisfactory implementation requirements, appearance before the State Board of Education is required.

School Three–met the .3 gain for the first monitoring period and met expected progress by having two consecutive above unsatisfactory ratings in 2007 and 2008.

School Four–monitoring for expected progress begins with the 2004 report card. The school did not meet the .3 gain required in their first monitoring period. External Review Committee appointed with findings due by spring of 2008. If school four does not meet satisfactory implementation requirements, appearance before the State Board of Education is required.

IMPACT DATA FOR PROPOSED EXPECTED PROGRESS CRITERIA

These data are the result of using the 2000 preliminary report card absolute values for the initial year and the 2003 absolute values as the first monitoring year.

One hundred and one schools with an unsatisfactory absolute rating on the 2000 data were tracked for three additional years.

The 2003 data reveal:

- 73% (74 schools) met expected progress,
- 27% (27 schools) failed to meet expected progress,
- 10 schools (all secondary) failed to meet the 1.8 minimum value, and
- 17 schools failed to meet the .3 gain (3 elementary, 13 middle, and 1 secondary)

Beginning with the 2004 report card, the maximum absolute value for the unsatisfactory category will increase .1 point for **each** year until 2014. This annual increase will impact the number of schools not meeting expected progress.

APPENDIX C

Strategy for Placing On-Site Personnel for 2003–04 School Year

Priority for 2003–04	2001 Rating	2002 Rating	2002 Absolute Value	Tier	Number of Schools	On–Site Assistance	Notes	Budgeted Salaries with supplements
1	any	unsatisfactory	1.0–1.6	1	16	PL, CS, TSOS	Place Part time TSOS, CS if needed	All (part time TSOS, CS receive 50% of salary and 50% of supplement)
2	any	unsatisfactory	1.7–2.1	2	31	CS, TSOS	Place Part time TSOS, CS if needed	All (part time TSOS, CS receive 50% of salary and 50% of supplement)
3	unsatisfactory	Below average	2.2–2.5	3	23	TSOS	Place Part time TSOS if needed	All (part time TSOS receive 50% of salary and 50% of supplement)
4	Below average or higher	Below average	2.2	3	10	CIF		All
5	Below average or higher	Below average	2.3	3	25	2 Part time CIFs (ELA and Math)		$5,000 supplement only
6	Below average or higher	Below average	2.4	3	29	2 Part time CIFs (ELA and Math)		$5,000 supplement only
7	Below average or higher	Below average	2.5	3	33	2 Part time CIFs (ELA and Math)		$5,000 supplement only

Part Time TSOS and CIFs:

- Must apply and meet qualifications
- From within district/school as recommended by superintendent
- Must attend initial training and professional development throughout year
- Provide one year of service
- Hold regular classroom duties 50% or more

▪ Updated May 6, 2003

APPENDIX D: Criteria for Alternative Technical Assistance Program

1. Collaborative Learning Communities **The program organizes adults into learning communities that foster collegiality and collaboration whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district and whose purpose is to improve student achievement.**				
0 Weak Evidence ☐The program does not organize school teams and/or leadership teams to improve student performance. ☐The program requires school teams to meet quarterly at a scheduled time to examine standards students are required to master, monitor student progress toward meeting the standards, develop more effective lesson plans, critique student work, assess the effectiveness of instruction, and identify needs for staff development. ☐The program does not provide staff development for teachers, families, and local community entities specifically to create positive home/school relationships that support student learning. ☐The program does not require two-way communication with parents and the community.	**1** ☐ The program organizes school teams and/or leadership teams to make collaborative decisions to improve student performance. ☐The program requires school teams to meet monthly at a scheduled time during a regular school day to examine standards students are required to master, monitor student progress toward meeting the standards, develop more effective lesson plans, critique student work, assess the effectiveness of instruction, and identify needs for staff development. ☐The program provides minimal staff development for teachers specifically to create positive home/school relationships that support student learning. ☐The program requires two-way communication with parents and the community.	**2** ☐ The program organizes school and leadership teams to make collaborative decisions to improve student performance. ☐The program requires school teams to meet monthly at a scheduled time during a regular school day to examine standards students are required to master, monitor student progress toward meeting the standards, develop more effective lesson plans, critique student work, assess the effectiveness of instruction, and identify needs for staff development. ☐The program provides periodic staff development for teachers and families specifically to create positive home/school relationships that support student learning. ☐The program requires two-way communication with parents and the community in a variety of ways but does not include the use of technology.	**3** ☐ The program organizes school and leadership teams and trains them to make collaborative decisions to improve student performance. ☐The program requires school teams to meet bi-weekly at a scheduled time during a regular school day to examine standards students are required to master, monitor student progress toward meeting the standards, develop more effective lesson plans, critique student work, assess the effectiveness of instruction, and identify needs for staff development. ☐The program provides on-going staff development for teachers, families, and local community entities specifically to create positive home/school relationships that support student learning. ☐The program requires two-way communication with parents and the community in a variety of ways, including the use of technology.	**4 Strong Evidence** ☐ The program organizes school and leadership teams and trains them to make collaborative decisions to improve student performance. ☐The program requires school teams to meet weekly at a scheduled time during a regular school day to examine standards students are required to master, monitor student progress toward meeting the standards, develop more effective lesson plans, critique student work, assess the effectiveness of instruction, and identify needs for staff development. ☐The program provides on-going staff development for teachers, families, and local community entities specifically to create positive home/school relationships that support student learning. ☐The program requires two-way communication with parents and the community in a variety of ways, including the use of technology.

2. Leadership **The program improves the learning of all students by developing a skillful school leader who models and guides community and staff in continuous school improvement.**				
0 Weak Evidence ☐ The program does not have a leadership team. ☐ The program does not provide the administration with support in the skill areas needed to implement the comprehensive school improvement plan. ☐ The program does not build leadership skills among the staff and does not promote distributive leadership. ☐ The program does not align its leadership training with any of the requisite proficient skills outlined in the South Carolina Department of Education Principal Evaluation Instrument.	**3** ☐ The program includes a leadership team that provides guidance with regard to the allocation of time and resources, decision-making, setting priorities, and implementing research based instructional strategies that improve teaching and learning. ☐ The program provides the administration with little or no support in the skill areas needed to implement the comprehensive school improvement plan. ☐ The program does not build leadership skills among the staff and does not promote distributive leadership. ☐ The program aligns its leadership training with some of the requisite proficient skills outlined in the South Carolina Department of Education Principal Evaluation Instrument.	**6** ☐ The program includes a leadership team with family representation that provides guidance with regard to the allocation of time and resources, decision-making, setting priorities, and implementing research based instructional strategies that improve teaching and learning. ☐ The program provides the administration with support in the skill areas needed to implement the comprehensive school improvement plan. ☐ The program builds leadership skills among the staff but does not promote distributive leadership. ☐ The program aligns its leadership training with the requisite proficient skills outlined in the South Carolina Department of Education Principal Evaluation Instrument.	**9** ☐ The program includes a leadership team with family and community representation that provides guidance with regard to the allocation of time and resources, decision-making, setting priorities, and implementing research based instructional strategies that improve teaching and learning. ☐ The program provides the administration with support in the skill areas needed to implement the comprehensive school improvement plan. ☐ The program builds leadership skills among the staff and promotes distributive leadership. ☐ The program aligns its leadership training with the requisite proficient skills outlined in the South Carolina Department of Education Principal Evaluation Instrument.	**12 Strong Evidence** ☐ The program includes a leadership team with family and community representation and other school level teams that provide guidance with regard to the allocation of time and resources, decision-making, setting priorities, and implementing research based instructional strategies that improve teaching and learning. ☐ The program provides the administration with support in the skill areas needed to implement the comprehensive school improvement plan. ☐ The program builds leadership skills among the staff and promotes distributive leadership. ☐ The program aligns its leadership training with the requisite exemplary skills outlined in the South Carolina Department of Education Principal Evaluation Instrument.

3. Data-Driven **The program design requires the school leadership to use a variety of data, including the school report card, to inform decision-making and monitor program performance.**				
0 Weak Evidence ☐ The program does not use data to inform decision making and monitor program performance.	**2** The program uses some data and methods of data analysis annually to: ☐ determine the needs of the school, ☐ regularly monitor the implementation of the program, and ☐ provide evidence of school improvement. ☐ The program uses only traditional assessment strategies at the classroom level. ☐ The program uses benchmark testing to inform instruction. ☐ The program has the technology to support the analysis of benchmark testing.	**4** The program uses some data and methods of data analysis at least semi-annually to: ☐ determine the needs of the school, ☐ regularly monitor the implementation of the program, and ☐ provide evidence of school improvement. ☐ The program uses only traditional assessment strategies at the classroom level. ☐ The program uses benchmark testing to inform instruction. ☐ The program has the technology to support the analysis of benchmark testing.	**6** The program uses various data and methods of data analysis at least quarterly to: ☐ determine the needs of the school, ☐ regularly monitor the implementation of the program, and ☐ provide evidence of school improvement. ☐ The program uses traditional and non-traditional assessment strategies at the classroom level. ☐ The program uses benchmark testing to inform instruction. ☐ The program has the technology to support the analysis of benchmark testing.	**8 Strong Evidence** The program continuously uses various data and methods of data analysis to: ☐ determine the needs of the school, ☐ regularly monitor the implementation of the program, and ☐ provide evidence of school improvement. ☐ The program uses traditional and non-traditional assessment strategies at the classroom level. ☐ The program uses benchmark testing to inform instruction. ☐ The program has the technology to support the analysis of benchmark testing.

Methods of data analysis include but are not limited to: data disaggregation, gap analysis, trend analysis, and test item differentiation.

4. Comprehensive Planning **The program design employs a comprehensive system appropriate for addressing the needs of the school and the goal to improve student achievement.**				
0 Weak Evidence ☐ The program does not have an inclusive and comprehensive system for improving student achievement and overall school improvement.	**2** ☐ The program has a preplanning phase to assess the needs of the school in the areas of student achievement and teacher and leadership quality but does not include school climate. ☐ The program personnel collaborates with school staff to develop a plan for school improvement. ☐ The program implementation of the plan provides high quality staff development opportunities appropriate for the school staff throughout a designated implementation period.	**4** ☐ The program has a preplanning phase to assess the needs of the school in the areas of student achievement, teacher and leadership quality, and school climate. ☐ The program personnel collaborate with school staff and students, where appropriate, to develop a comprehensive plan for school improvement that is shared with the district and other stakeholders. ☐ The program implementation of the comprehensive plan provides job-embedded training and high quality staff development opportunities based on change theory and adult learning principles appropriate for the school staff throughout a designated implementation period.	**6** ☐ The program has a preplanning phase to assess the needs of the school in the areas of student achievement, teacher and leadership quality, and school climate. ☐ The program personnel collaborate with school staff, students, where appropriate, and other stakeholders to develop a comprehensive plan for school improvement that is shared with the district. ☐ The program implementation of the comprehensive plan provides on-site personnel to support job-embedded training and high quality staff development opportunities based on change theory and adult learning principles appropriate for the school staff throughout a designated implementation period.	**8 Strong Evidence** ☐ The program has a preplanning phase to assess the needs of the school in the areas of student achievement, teacher and leadership quality, and school climate. ☐ The program personnel collaborate with district and school staff, students, where appropriate, and other stakeholders to develop a comprehensive plan for school improvement. ☐ The program implementation of the comprehensive plan provides on-site personnel to support job-embedded training and high quality staff development opportunities based on change theory and adult learning principles appropriate for the school staff throughout a designated implementation period.

5. Instructional Focus **The program creates an atmosphere of high expectations for all staff and students to improve the academic achievement of all students.**				
0 Weak Evidence ☐ The program does not ensure that the core curriculum is aligned with the state standards. ☐The program does not provide professional development for the staff in such areas as content knowledge, instructional strategies, alignment of curriculum to instruction, assessment, differentiated instruction, and classroom management. ☐The program does not expect students to achieve at high levels through the implementation of research-based instructional strategies. ☐The program does not establish school-wide expectations for student behavior. ☐ The program does not address the diversity of students and staff.	**3** ☐ The program ensures that the core curriculum is aligned with the state academic standards. ☐The program provides limited professional development for the staff in such areas as content knowledge, instructional strategies, alignment of curriculum to instruction, assessment, differentiated instruction, and classroom management. ☐The program expects all students to achieve at high levels through the implementation of research-based instructional strategies. ☐The program establishes school-wide expectations for student behavior that are equitably enforced. ☐ The program addresses the diversity of students and staff.	**6** ☐ The program ensures that the core curriculum is aligned with the state academic standards. ☐The program provides periodic professional development for the staff in such areas as content knowledge, instructional strategies, alignment of curriculum to instruction, assessment, differentiated instruction, and classroom management. ☐The program expects all students to achieve at high levels through the implementation of research-based instructional strategies. ☐The program establishes school-wide expectations for student behavior that are theoretically based and equitably enforced. ☐ The program addresses the diversity of students and staff as a means to promote student success.	**9** ☐ The program ensures that the core curriculum is aligned with all of the state academic standards and integrated throughout all subject areas. ☐The program provides on-going, job-embedded professional development for the staff in such areas as content knowledge, instructional strategies, alignment of curriculum to instruction, assessment, differentiated instruction, and classroom management. ☐The program expects all students to achieve at high levels through the implementation of research-based instructional strategies and interventions consistent with the needs of students. ☐ The program establishes school-wide expectations for student behavior that are theoretically based and equitably enforced. ☐ The program addresses the diversity of students and staff as a means to promote student success.	**12 Strong Evidence** ☐ The program ensures that the core curriculum is aligned with all of the state academic standards and integrated throughout all subject areas. ☐The program provides on-going, job-embedded professional development for the staff in such areas as content knowledge, instructional strategies, alignment of curriculum to instruction, assessment, differentiated instruction, and classroom management. ☐The program expects all students to achieve at high levels through the implementation of research-based instructional strategies and interventions consistent with the needs of students. ☐The program establishes school-wide expectations for student behavior that are theoretically based and equitably enforced. ☐ The program addresses the diversity of students and staff in a variety of ways as a means to promote student success.

6. Student Performance **The program has current statistical data that demonstrates program success.**				
0 Weak Evidence ☐ There is no valid, reliable statistical data available on improved student achievement from schools with similar demographics.	**4** ☐ There is limited valid, reliable statistical data available on improved student achievement from schools with similar demographics.	**8** ☐ There is some valid, reliable statistical data available on improved student achievement from schools with similar demographics.	**12** ☐ There is adequate valid, reliable statistical data available on improved student achievement from schools with similar demographics.	**16 Strong Evidence** ☐ There is ample valid, reliable statistical data available on sustained, improved student achievement from schools with similar demographics.

In accordance with Regulation 1520, the program effectiveness after two years will be evaluated using the scale below.

7. Expected Results After Two-Years of Implementation **The program meets expected progress.**				
0 Weak Evidence ☐ The school's absolute index decreases or remains the same over a two-year period.	**1** ☐ The school's absolute index increases by .1 of a point in a two-year period.	**2** ☐ The school's absolute index increases by .2 of a point in a two-year period.	**3** ☐ The school's absolute index increases by .3 of a point in a two-year period.	**4 Strong Evidence** ☐ The school's absolute index increases by more than .3 of a point in a two-year period.